THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

SAMPLE COPY

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Subscribers In 50 States

RETURN ADDRESS
7314 Zimpel Street
New Orleans 18, Louisiana

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
New Orleans, La.
Permit No. 330

FORM 3547 Requested

Vol. VI - No. 8 | NOVEMBER - DECEMBER, 1960 | New Orleans, La.

U.S. Has No Power Over Schools--Ex-Dean

An Indiana constitutional lawyer and former dean of Notre Dame university's law school declared here today he felt the federal government has no power over public education.

Questioned on Louisiana's right to interpose its sovereignty in school integration, Dr. Clarence Manion of South Bend, commented:

"As I interpret the constitution, the federal government has the right to see that nobody is deprived of the right to vote regardless of race, color or previous condition of servitude, and federal intervention to preserve the right to vote, done by a proper law of Congress, is entirely right and proper, but, as I interpret it, I think it ends at that point.

"I don't think it carries over to education, traffic and the like."

Manion, a drumbeater for Conservative political philosophy, declared he could not predict the outcome of Louisiana efforts to interpose itself between the edicts of the federal government because it "is a question never answered in law."

He said Thomas Jefferson maintained interposition is possible and that the War Between the States was the result of the difference in belief, but that it never was settled in law.

"This matter of interposition," Manion said in an interview, "is another way of saying where the state is a defendant against the federal government it can win. The state is supposed to be just as sovereign as the federal government."

The 10th Amendment gives to the states those "powers not reserved" to the United States, he explained. Just where the dividing line lies is a matter of interpretation, he said.

The visitor indicated, however, that the U.S. supreme court might use its "legal precedent" set in the 1954 integration decision to defeat Louisiana on the matter of powers over public education.

Right to Impose

"There is no question about the constitutional right to equal suffrage, but that is completely unrelated to school segregation," he said.

Manion said that Louisiana certainly has the right to interpose its sovereignty whether it is decided in the state's favor or not.

But the right of individual members of the United States is slipping away, in Manion's view, and he said conservatism is winning inroads as a result.

—States-Item Photo.
DR. CLARENCE MANION

Vote Conservative

He said all of the Nixon vote was conservative in opposition to Kennedy's vast "give everybody, everywhere, everything" program. And 20 per cent of Kennedy's vote, he said, were conservatives of the South and other places who followed because of the party label.

Manion said he is "an old-fashioned Southern Democrat, born in Kentucky.

He said conservative has become a bad word when it should be considered in the same vein as "conservationist." The conservatives aim to conserve the nation's legal and spiritual resources, he said.

Right to Limit

The individual's right to limit his government, Manion observed, should also include the right to enjoin the use of tax monies for unconstitutional purposes.

He blasted foreign aid as totally unconstitutional and a drain on the country's dollar resources.

Asked if he would do away with foreign aid completely, he replied: "Absolutely. It is time we got somebody to aid us.

"We must establish American strength to hold our position in the world. The thing that wins international presige is not friendship, but respect. As long as we are strong we are going to be all right."

(Reprinted from NEW ORLEANS STATES-ITEM)

Pro-Red Jessup Represents U. S. on World Court

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

(Copyright, 1960, King Features Syndicate, Inc.)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18--The United States is supporting for a seat on the World Court Philip Jessup, the New Deal-Fair Deal policy-maker whom the Senate refused to confirm as UN Ambassador almost a decade ago.

Jessup slipped into comparative obscurity after his rebuff at the hands of the Senate, only to pop up as the Administration's choice for the nine-year term as judge on the Court. He will succeed Judge Green H. Hackworth, who has represented the U.S. since 1946. The selection of Jessup, ironically, was made not by the State Department, but by a group of lawyers appointed by the International Court of Arbitration in the Hague.

Hackworth, who was nominated this year to serve another term by 11 Western European, Latin American and Asian nations, threw in the sponge after learning that his own nation was not supporting him. Jessup was backed by Britain, France and Canada in addition to the U.S.

Jessup was a dominant American policy-maker in the Asian field and a leading associate of former State Secretary Dean Acheson. He was a member, along with Alger Hiss, of the first U.S. delegation to the United Nations, and although the Senate refused in 1951 to approve his selection as chief ambassador to the UN, he served as ambassador to the General Assembly until 1953 and the advent of the Eisenhower Administration.

The reasons that Jessup was turned down for the UN post make interesting reading today. Jessup was found to be a wheelhorse of the Institute of Pacific Relations, labeled "a vehicle used by Communists to orientate American Far Eastern policy toward Communist objectives" by a Congressional committee that spent almost two years investigating it. The IPR was honeycombed with Communists; the McCarran Committee reported that 43 persons connected with the group were identified party members and that at least eight others had collaborated with the Soviet intelligence.

In 1945, Jessup--a member of the IPR's Board of Trustees and Chairman of its Research Advisory Committee--recommended the selection of 33 delegates to the Institute's Hot Springs Conference in January of that year. Of that group 10 have since been identified, under oath, as Communists, although some of them have

(Please see JESSUP - Page 6)

KENNEDY'S STRANGE VIEWS ON RED POLAND

By Michael Padev
Foreign Editor of The Star

No part of Senator Kennedy's new book, "The Strategy of Peace," is more baffling than his chapter on Poland and Eastern Europe.

Senator Kennedy's view on the subject can be summed up in one sentence--America should help Communist leaders like Wladyslaw Gomulka, the present Communist dictator of Poland. Senator Kennedy strongly attacks the Eisenhower Administration for giving "too little and too late" assistance to Gomulka. The Polish Communist government required first $300,000,000 in aid, Senator Kennedy explains, but the U.S. government agreed "only to one-third of that amount" (a mere $100,000,000).

Next, Senator Kennedy criticizes the United States for not helping the Polish Communist authorities rebuild quickly their coal-mining industry -- for "only" $30,000,000 of additional American assistance. Senator Kennedy argues that American machinery and new mines "would do wonders" for the Polish economy. The senator also says that America should help Poland in obtaining "farm machinery, fertilizers, seeds" etc. Poland was once, he says, the "breadbasket of East Europe" -- now she has not enough grain to supply her own people.

It is, of course, true that Poland was once (under capitalism) the breadbasket of Europe and that now (under communism) she can't produce enough to feed her own people. It is also true that American machinery and other assistance can "do wonders" with the Polish economy. But the same is true of every other Eastern Europe country, and of Russia as well. Russia was once (before the Communists took over) the breadbasket of the whole world. Now her Communist economy cannot produce enough to feed her own people adequately. Does that mean that the American taxpayer has to lend his helping hand in order to make the inefficient Russian Communist system less inefficient?

NONE OF THEM IS

Senator Kennedy argues "Poland may still be a satellite government - but the Poles are not a satellite people." Neither are the Hungarians and neither are the Ukranians. No nation living under Communist rule is sold on communism. If there were free elections inside the Communist empire, Communist candidates wouldn't be able to get more than five per cent of the vote -- and that goes for China as well as for Czechoslovakia, for Albania as well as for Estonia. Does that mean that the United States has to help the Communist rulers of those unhappy countries consolidate their own murderous regimes by making their tottering economies work?

The latest reliable information from Poland, which should be available to Senator Kennedy, proves beyond doubt that American help to Gomulka has helped the Communist dictator tighten his grip on the Polish people. Collective farming is being re-introduced, youth organizations are again put under strict party control, the relative cultural freedom which existed a few years ago is rapidly disappearing. Poland's Gomulka may be behind Hungary's Kadar in achieving complete communization of his country, but both these Communist leaders were traveling the same road--the road to communism.

Gomulka and Kadar, the same as Russia's Khrushchev and Red China's Mao, are tough Communist fanatics, who may disagree from time to time on certain technical details of their respective economic programs, but who are absolutely united on all essentials of the Communist political purpose and aims, the chief of which is the destruction of the United States. To help one of them is to help all of them.

I am told that Senator Kennedy has expressed these views on Poland and Eastern Europe in the hope of influencing the so-called "Polish" and "Eastern European" vote in the United States. People of Polish and Eastern European origin, the argument goes, would favor American assistance to their "old country." I doubt that. Americans who have family links with the Soviet enslaved Eastern Europe are, in the vast majority, well acquainted with Communist problems. Unlike Senator Kennedy, they know that help to the Communist rulers of Eastern Europe does not assist the nations living there. On the contrary -- such help only harms these nations, because it assists their Red jailers.

Help to Communist regimes and Communist rulers has--and can have--one result only: It strengthens the Communist regimes and the Communist rulers. It is indeed discouraging that a prominent American politician and the President-Elect has not seen--or cannot see--this very simple and very obvious truth.

(Reprinted from THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR)

The Record Proves It

Between purges in Russia, firing squads in Cuba, salami tactics in West Berlin and chicken-peeling in Manhattan, the Communists are certainly living up to their reputations as international butchers.

True American Ideals Needed For New Party

(Reprinted from the FORT LAUDERDALE NEWS)

AMERICA doesn't need a "Third Party." It needs a new First Party.

The old parties have outlived their usefulness.

They are under the domination of one-track minds with the only differences in platforms so slight that the average citizen is completely bewildered over where they intend to take us.

All of this comes about because the so-called liberal element of our society has all but taken over the country.

No one in either party is speaking out for true American free enterprise, for real safeguards against inflation, for reduction in the tax structure, for real State's rights, or the many other things that once made this nation the greatest in the world.

A new First Party could clear the air. Let's get started!

An Open Letter to Senator Barry Goldwater

From

Phoebe Courtney, Editor

Senator Barry Goldwater
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

November 25, 1960

Dear Senator Goldwater:

On April 12, 1960, I wrote you a personal letter in which I begged you not to endorse and campaign for Nixon, because I predicted that it would cause great confusion in the ranks of the Conservatives. This is one prediction I am not happy to have seen come about.

If the United States is to survive as a Constitutional Republic, there must be concerted action by Conservatives throughout the land, and the first requisite is that any confusion as to where Senator Barry Goldwater actually stands, and what Senator Goldwater actually intends to do, must be dispelled as soon as possible.

You and I, Senator Goldwater, are in complete agreement on Conservative principles. Any disagreement which may arise is solely in the field of "methods" and "analysis of political techniques."

ROCKEFELLER

The public press has quoted you as saying that Rockefeller is no longer powerful in the Republican Party, because he failed to carry New York State for the Republicans. I disagree! In the August, 1960 issue of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, I wrote:

"It is the considered opinion of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN that Rockefeller will give lip service only to the Nixon-Lodge ticket during the coming campaign, while all the time working behind the scenes to actually promote the election of Kennedy. Rockefeller has absolutely no intention of waiting around until 1968 to try again for the presidency."

I personally consider it downright dangerous to minimize the power of International Socialist Nelson Rockefeller for the following reasons:

(1) Rockefeller managed to exert "two-way" control over the Republican platform at the Chicago Convention, first through placing "his man," Charles Percy, as Chairman of the Republican Platform Committee; and then by exhibiting that he had the power to summon the Vice President of the United States to visit him in New York prior to the Convention, so he, Rockefeller, could lay down his terms.

(2) Then Rockefeller saw to it that "foot-in-the-mouth" Lodge was placed at Nixon's side as his Vice Presidential candidate so Lodge could say the wrong thing at the right moment, in case Nixon should get "out of hand" and begin to make progress, and lastly Rockefeller made sure that Nixon did not get the electoral votes of the State of New York.

All of the above, Rockefeller did in 1960 and will again in 1964 - only more so. And yet you say Rockefeller's power has diminished in the Republican Party!

I sincerely believe, Senator Goldwater, that when a people are faced with the threat of a man such as Rockefeller, who seeks only one thing in this world - power - that the people's only defense is to take, defend, and advance the position of uncompromising, high moral principles. This, I believe, is the only way that Rockefeller and his minions can be stopped. History is replete with examples that "right conquers might."

GOLDWATER AT THE GOP CONVENTION IN 1960

I believe now, as I believed at the time of the Republican Convention, and I am sure that the majority of the Goldwater workers who were on the scene in Chicago will agree, that if you had stuck to your guns -- if you had wooed delegate votes -- if you had gone to the floor of the Convention and fought Rockefeller on each and every plank of the platform on a roll-call basis, that by the time that roll-call was through and the platform had been "hashed out," that the back of the Rockefeller machine would have been broken. This, of course, as you know, would have taken place on nationwide TV, and there is no doubt in my mind as to the outcome.

GOLDWATER'S VIEW ON "THIRD PARTY" BEFORE THE ELECTION

On October 12, 1960, speaking in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Mr. W. F. Minor, TIMES-PICAYUNE staff correspondent, quotes you as stating "Third party movements are not good for our Republic."

THE AMERICAN STATESMAN (Aug. 12), Salt Lake City, Utah,

(Please see GOLDWATER - Page 6)

Kennedy Not Elected Yet!

(Reprinted from CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS

For several years, a few voices crying in the political wilderness have counseled that the South's only real hope of gaining fair consideration in the Federal Government is by working itself into the position where it would hold the balance of power in the electoral vote, and thus be able to be decisive in the choice of a President.

By a gradual process, Southern political power has been pared away. The Democratic Party, Presidents, Congress and the Supreme Court often have ridden roughshod over Southern viewpoints and rights. This would be uncomfortable for the South but less serious were it not for the fact that this process has also surely damaged the Constitution of the United States.

It has been counseled that if the South would just band together and withhold its electoral votes from the candidates of both major political parties, neither could achieve an electoral majority. Thus both would have to seek those withheld Southern votes, and neither could win until guarantees were given for a resumption of constitutional government and an end to the anti-South campaign.

But when suggestions of that kind were made, there always were many who replied that the idea was "visionary," or "impractical," or just "wouldn't work" for some other reason.

Yet today the South has before it living proof that the independent elector plan could work.

Sen. John Kennedy currently leads in states having 300 electoral votes, with 269 needed for election. But if Georgia exercised the power of its 12 unpledged Democratic electors, and was joined by Arkansas with its 8 unpledged Democratic electors, and by Louisiana with its 10 unpledged Democratic electors, these votes could be withheld from both Kennedy and Nixon.

Thus Kennedy's electoral vote would dwindle to 270.

And if he lost only two more electoral votes, he could not win!

If South Carolina had joined in the independent elector movement, its 8 electoral votes could easily have been withheld.

Even now, the MOBILE PRESS and the MOBILE REGISTER are urging an "elector revolt" throughout the South to deny Sen. Kennedy Southern electoral votes, thus giving Southern electors "yes or no" power over selection of the next President. The MOBILE PRESS declared editorially recently that the stakes are so high the South "must seize the opportunity."

Today the independent elector plan does not appear so visionary, so impractical, so unworkable as critics of it were claiming a month ago. Today there is clear proof it would work.

The South and Constitution face the prospect of a new President, a new Congress and the same old Warren Court that will give the South and the Constitution little fair consideration in the four years ahead.

Just consider how different the outlook would be if the South were exercising its electoral power to have the deciding voice in the election of a President, refusing to give its votes to anyone until Southern terms for a return to constitutional government were met!

(Editor's note: THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN is proud to have been, since 1955, one of the "few voices crying in the political wilderness" urging support for the Independent Elector Plan as a means for Conservatives to defeat the Socialism of both the Democrat and the Republican parties.)

Electoral Revolt Brewing

In the above editorial, reprinted from the CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS, Lee Anderson, editor, points out that the razor-thin closeness of the Presidential election is "living proof" that the Independent Elector Plan could work. The Electoral College, composed of the Presidential Electors, meets December 19.

Kennedy has only 300 electoral votes. If 32 Southern Electoral votes now pledged to Kennedy are denied Kennedy because of citizen action at the "grass roots", John Kennedy may not be the next President of the United States!

If you wish to help in the "Electoral Revolt" now being spearheaded by the MOBILE PRESS and the MOBILE REGISTER to deny Southern votes to Kennedy in the Electoral College, here is what you can do:

(1) Write the following Governors at the State Capitol Buildings of their respective States, and request that they urge the Presidential Electors of their States to withhold the States' Electoral votes from Kennedy:

Gov. Jimmie Davis - Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Gov. John Patterson - Montgomery, Alabama
Gov. Orval Faubus - Little Rock, Arkansas
Gov. Ernest Vandiver - Atlanta, Georgia
Gov. Luther H. Hodges - Raleigh, North Carolina
Gov. Ernest F. Hollings - Columbia, South Carolina
Gov. Price Daniel - Austin, Texas

(2) Write the Secretaries of State, addressing them at the State Capitol Building of each of the above States, and request the names and home addresses of the Democratic Presidential Electors. Write these Electors and urge them to withhold their votes from Kennedy in the Electoral College in order that neither Kennedy nor Nixon can achieve the needed 269 Electoral votes. The election would then be thrown into the House of Representatives, where it is entirely possible that such a deadlock would develop that a compromise candidate would emerge -- one who could obtain complete backing by the South, as well as backing by Conservatives throughout the nation who had previously supported Nixon as the "lesser of two evils." A man who could measure up to these specifications is Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia.

(3) Write letters to the editors of your local papers bringing out the facts contained in this article, and urging readers to also join this "Elector Revolt" so that the Conservatives of this nation, who are actually in the majority, can bring about the election of a true Conservative.

Vote Holdup Asked

(Reprinted from New Orleans STATES-ITEM, 11/22/60)

Word from President-elect John F. Kennedy that he will not comment on action of a federal court restraining the Louisiana Legislature on integration affairs has brought a threat to withhold the state's 10 electoral votes.

At Leesville, Jesse Funderburk, chairman of Louisiana's Eighth congressional district executive committee, urged an immediate special meeting of Louisiana's Democratic central committee.

Purpose of the meeting would be to withhold the 10 electoral votes from Kennedy because of his stand on the integration question.

The Independent American

Published approximately every four to six weeks by
FREE MEN SPEAK, INC.
7314 Zimpel Street • New Orleans 18, Louisana

Kent H. Courtney ..... President
Phoebe Greene Courtney .....Editor and Secty. - Treasurer
Mary Helen Brengel .....Assistant Editor
Entered as third class matter at the New Orleans Post Office

Copyright 1960 by THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: One year (or 12 issues): $3.00; two years (or 24 issues): $5.00.

OUR POLICY

This newspaper is dedicated to the defeat of Socialist and Communist influences that now pervade the thinking and the policies of our Federal government and the two major political parties. We believe that there is no difference between a New Deal Democrat and a Socialist-Internationalist Republican.

This newspaper will continue to promote all individuals and organizations who believe that a new political party based on Constitutional States Rights is the answer to the Socialism that has captured both (formerly great) parties.

We will never align ourselves with any person or group which preaches hatred. Instead we will conserve our energy for the fight against atheistic Communism, and we pledge ourselves to LOVE OF GOD AND AN INDEPENDENT U.S.A.

OUR THANKS

Because we are political and "controversial" we have no advertising income. We therefore thank all of our readers who send donations every week so that more and more sample copies can be sent to patriots throughout the country. Without this regular support, this experiment in patriotic and political journalism would not be possible.

More Federal Interference

By Thurman Sensing

(Reprinted from Southern States Industrial Council BULLETIN)

One of the planks in the Democratic Party platform states that the problems of American cities are the responsibility of the Federal Government. Incorporated in this plank is a proposal that a cabinet-rank Secretary of Urban Affairs be named to handle the problems of U. S. cities.

This is a major "liberal" drive, and the nation will hear a great deal more about it in the months and years ahead. The costs of the various Federal Aid to cities proposals are simply fabulous.

For example, a special Harvard-Massachusetts Institute of Technology study recommends spending $42 BILLION on cities during the next decade. The Committee for Economic Development (CED) has just published a report entitled "Guiding Metropolitan Growth" that looks to massive federal handouts to cities costing hundreds of millions.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors already is discussing how the Federal Aid pie can be cut. Ignored are the underlying assumptions of the suggested programs. One of these assumptions is that cities, including some of the richest metropolitan areas in the United States, are unable to help themselves. Basic to the programs is the notion that self-reliance is an impossible policy for big urban centers.

These are unwarranted ideas. There is no reason to believe that making a Federal Department of Urban Affairs city hall for all America will result in a cure of urban ills. How can Federal bureaucrats in Washington know more about the problems of Charleston, S. C., Nashville, Tennessee, Shreveport, La., and other cities than the city fathers of those communities? Obviously, they cannot.

If city fathers have to run to Washington for help to keep their communities afloat, then there must be bad management in a great many city halls. There must be an appalling lack of community vision and enterprise.

Indeed one can conclude that demands for Federal Aid may be a measure of municipal incompetence. If a city can't keep abreast of paving, lighting and sewer problems, then it must be the victim of mismanagement. What Federal Aid would do is to cover up incompetence and mismanagement. It would mean that well-run cities, enjoying good local government, would have to finance cities where local government is second or third-rate. But the U.S. Treasury should not be a pool into which politicians can dip in order to cover up their failures.

Aside from this, implicit in the aid to urban areas programs is the notion that the Federal Government has a money tree growing in the District of Columbia. How can New York, Detroit, Philadelphia and other giant metropolitan centers -- which want the handout program -- expect to get more back than they contribute in taxes? After all, Washington hasn't any money of its own. What the government pays out comes in from the taxpayers.

Of course, the public should realize that such proposals are more political than economic. Political leaders like Senator Joseph Clark (D-Pa.), chief advocate of urban aid, are confirmed partisans of the liberal-left. They are not simply interested in bailing out cities but in making fundamental changes in the power structure of the United States. They would like to see local government wither away and be replaced by a monolithic state that tells cities what to do and what not to do. In this respect, Federal Aid to cities is a program parallel to Federal Aid to Education. Both have as their ultimate objective extension of Federal authority for the sake of power itself.

Good citizens who want to preserve both individual liberty and local control of communities should use their influence and votes to defeat urban aid proposals now being advocated.

INTERPOSITION IS THE ANSWER

(Reprinted from St. Mary Banner and Franklin Tribune, Franklin, Louisiana, Bob Angers, Jr., Editor.)

All of a sudden, Louisiana finds herself in headlines around the nation and around the world because of one word -- "Interposition."

To "interpose" means "to place between". In this instance, the sovereign authority of the State of Louisiana has been placed between the people of the State and the U.S. Supreme Court.

Before the usual coterie of finger-pointers, troublemakers, eggheads, and Constitution-twisters descend on the State or emerge from the local woodwork these simple truths should be kept in mind:

Interposition is legal.

It is right.

It is American -- 100% All-American.

The tenth amendment of the U.S. Constitution reserves to the States any right not specifically spelled out in the Constitution.

A civil, moral and legal right that has always been exercised by the sovereign State of Louisiana is operation of its own system of education.

The law of the land in Louisiana, like any other State in the federal union of states, is written by the Louisiana legislature.

And where does the legislature get its authority? From the people of Louisiana -- from the consent of the governed.

And just what is the policy of the State of Louisiana as it applies to the all-important question of education? Segregated schools!

It's very simple. And it's very workable. And it has advanced the cause of human dignity beyond anything that has ever happened in the State. And it has been done without trouble, without violence without hatred.

The schools are segregated by race.

Just like many schools are segregated by sex.

And all churches are segregated by denominations.

And veteran groups are segregated based on wartime service.

And cities are segregated from parishes (counties) by boundary lines.

Ever since the American Republic was founded the Supreme Court has ruled that the maintenance of separate but equal schools was constitutional.

And all of these courts have understood that there would be some schools that had a skylight, and others without them; and some schools would be built of brick, and others of concrete block or lumber; and that some would have bands and football teams, and others would not; and some would have teachers with degrees from one college, and some from another.

Still, the "separate but equal" ruling prevailed.

It prevailed, that is, until the present Supreme Court was appointed. And this court included selection of a chief justice without prior judicial training or experience of any consequence, but with broad political appeal and influence and with unusual sociological theories of his own.

And this court ruled that, according to its interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment, the "separate but equal" doctrine was discriminatory and unconstitutional.

What all other courts before it found to be right and just and constitutional the new order ruled against, overturned.

Of course, the validity of the Fourteenth Amendment itself is questioned by many constitutional lawyers.

What remedy, what recourse does a State have against the federal tyranny?

INTERPOSITION IS THE ANSWER

And interposition, although it is tied up in legal language that is hard for most laymen to understand, is a weapon against tyranny that has been employed by some of the most distinguished names in American history.

This is a time of trial. It is a period that requires calm heads and stout hearts.

It is a time when the citizens of Louisiana should stand solidly behind the governor, the legislature, the superintendent of schools and all others who spearhead the battle against government encroachment.

This is the time when the people of America will be able to determine whether or not they live in a nation of 50 sovereign states from which the federal government derives its authority, or whether they are ruled by an all-powerful central authority that has absolutely refused to recognize the role of the states.

...School closure pales into insignificance when placed alongside the main issue.

And the main issue is really a very simple one: Will the citizens of Louisiana stand up for what America really stands for, or will they capitulate in the hour of decision?

The strength of America comes from the strength of her sovereign states. Pray that justice prevails.

MAN OF COURAGE

(Reprinted from THE STATE, Columbia, S.C.)

Senator Strom Thurmond has once again demonstrated that he is a man of conviction, courage and conscience.

Perhaps consistency should also be added.

Senator Thurmond attended the Democratic nominating convention as a delegate. He objected bitterly to the platform.

He was one of those insisting that the nomination of John F. Kennedy not be made unanimous.

After the convention, Senator Thurmond thoughtfully analyzed the Democratic platform, and concluded that it was a blueprint for socialism. He did not endorse the candidate.

The day before the election Senator Thurmond said he would have to vote his conscience, and if the bosses of the national party got angry, they would just have to get angry.

In contrast to Senator Thurmond, many other party leaders in South Carolina, who had objected to the platform and had joined the refusal to make the nomination of Kennedy unanimous, disregarded the shabby shenanigans in Los Angeles and began to campaing for the Kennedy-Johnson ("Austin and Boston") pair.

THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

Its Insidious Influence on U. S. Foreign Policy

by Mary Helen Brengel

Thoughtful citizens throughout the United States searched in vain during the recent presidential campaign for expression of an American foreign policy from either candidate or either party platform. During the past three decades, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the United States has adopted more and more the policies of appeasement, coexistence, and bipartisanship, all of which aid, wittingly or unwittingly, in the cause of Soviet world domination. The United Nations, in which the Communists exert tremendous influence, has become the cornerstone of U. S. foreign policy.

Spruille Braden, former U. S. Ambassador to various Latin American countries, and Asst. Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs, has stated:

"Since 1941, our government, by means of its own, and latterly through United Nations foreign aid, has been, and still is, subsidizing the U.S.S.R.'s long-range campaign against the U.S.A."

FOREIGN POLICY ASSN. MATERIALS LABELED "SUBVERSIVE"

The Foreign Policy Association has been one of the foremost organizations responsible for conditioning the minds of American citizens to the acceptance of appeasement policies. In March and April of this year, the Grand Jury of Fulton County (Atlanta), Georgia, declared the materials of the Foreign Policy Association "insidious and subversive." The Fulton County Grand Jury further recommended that "all textbook committee members - city, county and state - recognize the undesirable doctrines of this material, and take action to remove it from our schools."

Credit is due the Waldo M. Slaton Post No. 140 of the American Legion, who made the presentment to the Grand Jury, and furnished documented evidence regarding the personnel, background, and teaching materials of the Foreign Policy Association which has resulted in its removal from Atlanta schools.

The "Great Decisons" Program of the Foreign Policy Association has been a principal vehicle for the dissemination of Foreign Policy materials.

Further indication of the widespread dissemination of this "insidious and subversive" material is indicated by Father Richard Ginder of "Our Sunday Visitor." Father Ginder pointed out in his column "Right or Wrong?":

"With 600 college International Relations clubs affiliated and using Foreign Policy Association publications, the Association's influence is almost beyond measure. FPA has four regional offices: New Orleans, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Cleveland, with some 68 cooperating World Affairs Councils and local branches from Maine to Honolulu."

The United States Government has also assisted in distributing the poisonous propaganda of the Foreign Policy Association. Father Ginder went on to say:

"Our State Department has always cooperated closely with the Foreign Policy Association, and during World War II the U.S. Navy and other government agencies distributed FPA publications by the millions."

WHAT IS THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION?

The Foreign Policy Association was founded in 1918, and has been headed since its incorporation in 1928 by Vera Micheles Dean. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has documented the lengthy record of subversive affiliations and activities of Vera Micheles Dean, and this documentation is a part of the evidence upon which the Fulton County Grand Jury in Georgia based its decision.

The report of the Waldo M. Slaton Post 140 of the American Legion states:

"If the Foreign Policy Association has as many tentacles as an octopus and as many faces as sin, it has only one 'brain'. That is Vera Micheles Dean, the Russian-born, Harvard-educated Soviet propagandist and tireless lobbyist for Red China. This clever operator, whom Felix Wittmer has called 'the ubiquitous missionary for the Soviet Union' has a literary style that passes as 'objective' because it is unemotional as she pleads for the surrender of America to dishonor and disgrace. In her 'calm and measured' language - which for her shrewd purpose is colorless, odorless, and tasteless - she pours her distilled poison into the thought-stream of America, blurring its moral values, confusing its objectives, selling her suckers the Soviet bill of goods. In the name of American self-interest she can even turn patriots into pliable dupes, making Americans cooperate with her (through her "Great Decisions" plan) in the liquidation of America!"

Vera Micheles Dean is currently lecturing in American colleges and universities, in an effort to "brainwash" the youth of this nation and to influence them to accept the surrender of the national sovereignty and honor of America.

RELATIONSHIP TO INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

In 1951, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigated the Institute of Pacific Relations. The documents in the published hearings contain numerous references to the Foreign Policy Association, and prove the close relationship between the Foreign Policy Association and the IPR.

Edward C. Carter, secretary general of the IPR, gave a speech in March, 1944 which appears in the Institute of Pacific Relations hearings. According to this speech, the IPR was formed in 1925 as a "regional expression" of the purpose for which the Foreign Policy Association had earlier been formed on a national level. Carter's speech included statements concerning the plans of the IPR and the FPA and abounded with references to "the future organization of the world," "world organization," "the organization of the proposed 'community of nations,'" etc. He stressed that the Court of International Justice had prescribed "details for the operations of its ('community of nations') machinery...." (IPR Hearings, 1951, p. 5066.)

Significantly, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee listed among its conclusions regarding the Institute of Pacific Relations:

"Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist....The net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States."

The recent decision of the Fulton County Grand Jury in Atlanta, Georgia, labeling materials of the Foreign Policy Association "insidious and subversive," bears marked similarity to the 1951 conclusions drawn regarding its related organization, the Institute of Pacific Relations.

PURPOSE OF THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION:

The main purpose of the Foreign Policy Association is to employ all means of propaganda to "brainwash" the American people into accepting (a) Recognition of Red China; and (b) World Government through the United Nations.

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

The Foreign Policy Association publishes the FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION BULLETIN twice monthly. The Waldo M. Slaton Post 140 of the American Legion describes this bulletin as among the most instrumental of the FPA's many publications "in deadening the public conscience and consciousness to the evil and danger of Communism." The report of the Waldo M. Slaton Post continues:

"...This propaganda sheet, which brings to its readers purportedly 'serious' and 'objective' studies on pressing world problems, enjoys a wide readership, which even includes such government agencies as the U.S. Information Agency, the International Cooperation Administration (Foreign Aid), the Naval War College, the Army War College, Maxwell Air Force School, and others."

The report of American Legion members of the Waldo M. Slaton Post also states:

"...The FPA Bulletin feeds its readers a steady diet of left-wingers such as Emil Lengyel, Edwin Reischauer, Ernest Gross, Cyrus Eaton, Herbert Mathews, Henry Steele Commager, James Warburg, and, of course, that egregious authority on world affairs and boss of the whole FPA outfit, Vera Micheles Dean herself...."

Documenting these charges, the file assembled by the Waldo M. Slaton Post includes certain pages of the Foreign Policy Association Bulletin featuring the works of "pro-Communists, Communist-fronters, Red China-firsters and one-worlders," together with their records from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Notable among these is the record of Emil Lengyel, listed as having been associated with 18 Communist-front and subversive organizations and/or activities.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FOOT THE BILL FOR FPA

The American taxpayer is, to a large extent, footing the bills for this infusion of poison into the bloodstream of our nation through:

(1) The tax-exempt status of the Foreign Policy Association;

(2) Tax-exemption of the numerous foundations which contribute to the Foreign Policy Association;

(3) The purchase and distribution throughout the United States, through government agencies, of millions of copies of Foreign Policy Association publications;

(4) The purchase of Foreign Policy Association publications by the government in order to influence government personnel.

The cost to the American taxpayer, however, cannot be measured in this instance in tax dollars alone. Unless this deadly viper is immediately rendered harmless - unless an antidote is administered which will result in the establishment of a truly American foreign policy, the final cost of the Foreign Policy Association to the American people may include our priceless freedom.

• • • • • • • • • •

THANKS TO THE WALDO M. SLATON POST, AMERICAN LEGION

The Waldo M. Slaton Post has prepared an extensive documentation on the Foreign Policy Association which it prepared for the Fulton County Grand Jury, and is now making this available in booklet form. This booklet may be obtained at a cost of $1 each, or $5 for seven copies, by sending to:

Mr. William J. Riordan, Jr., Chairman,
Americanism Committee
Waldo M. Slaton Post No. 140
The American Legion
3905 Powers Ferry Road, N. W.,
Atlanta 5, Georgia

OTHER DOCUMENTATION:

Hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations
-Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1951

Hearings on Tax-Exempt Foundations
--Special Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, 1954

"Our Sunday Visitor" - Father Richard Ginder's column, "Right or Wrong?" - issues of June 5 and June 26, 1960. (Our Sunday Visitor - Huntington, Indiana)

"Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved."—Abraham Lincoln

Both Sides ?

(Reprinted from THE AMERICAN STATESMAN)

Recently, and many times before, we have been asked why we didn't present "both sides" of the picture.

What picture, we might ask?

Do they mean by both sides, the Democratic and Republican side? Do they mean the for and the against.

As was presented in an editorial, Oct. 14, 1960, in the GAZETTE TELEGRAPH, Colorado Springs, Colorado; "The Democrats are out and out Socialists. The Republicans are in and out Socialists."

Now, by both sides do they mean the Democratic side of Socialism and the Republican side of Socialism?

Now, by the picture do they mean Socialism?

Now, by for or against do they mean for is the Republican side and against is the Democrat side? You can change positions of the party names in the last sentence.

We feel we are positively, as opposed to negatively, presenting a side which is not presented in the large, majority press, radio, television, magazines and speakers bureaus.

We are for, not against freedom. We are for, not against individual responsibility. We are for, not against, the literal meaning of the Constitution of the United States. We are for, not against, the right of privacy. We are for, not against, the dignity of man.

We are against force.

We present the side of freedom, only. We feel freedom and principles have only one side.

We are for choice and we hope you have it. —J. Dohn Lewis.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper says "Bravo!" to the above.)

Listen to the RADIO EDITION of The INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

STATE	CITY	STATION	KILOCYCLES	DAY	TIME
ALABAMA	Selma	WHBB	1490	Sunday	6:00 P.M.
FLORIDA	Panama City	WDLP	590	Saturday	7:45 A.M.
LOUISIANA	Bastrop	KVOB	1340	Monday	6:30 A.M.
	New Orleans	WTMR	990	Thursday	5:15 P.M.
	Ruston	KRUS	1490	Sunday	6:15 P.M.
	Shreveport	KWKH	1130	Tuesday	7:15 P.M.
MISSISSIPPI	Grenada	WNAG	1400	Monday	6:15 P.M.
NORTH CAROLINA	Mount Airy	WPAQ	740	Saturday	5:45 P.M.
	Burlington	WBAG		Sunday	12:45 P.M.
	High Point	WHPE	1070	Sunday	12:45 P.M.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Greenville	WMUU	1260	Saturday	1:30 P.M.
TEXAS	Kermit	KERB	600	Sunday	12:30 P.M.
	Midland	KJBC	1150	Monday	12:00 Noon
VIRGINIA	Charlottesville	WCHV	1260	Tuesday	6:15 P.M.
	Lawrenceville	WLES	580	Saturday	9:00 A.M.
	Lynchburg	WBRG	1050		
	Petersburg	WPVA	1290	Sunday	1:45 P.M.
WASHINGTON	Tacoma	KTWR	103.9 Mc	Tuesday	6:45 P.M.
WISCONSIN	Manitowoc	WOMT	1240	Monday	6:45 P.M.
WYOMING	Buffalo	KBBS	1450	Wednesday	6:30 P.M.

The purpose of THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN is to give the Conservative side of the vital issues concerning this country today

CONSERVATIVE PROGRAMS AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL SPONSORSHIP

If you and your friends, or your business firm, would like to have these programs played over your local radio station, just write to Kent Courtney, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans 18, Louisiana, for complete details.

HELP SPREAD THE WORD

Every month, in order to combat the millions of words spewed out by the left-wing press, THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN distributes thousands of free sample copies.

These sample copies are paid for by the contributions sent in by our supporters, who wish in this way, to fight against the Socialists who have infiltrated every part of our government.

If you believe in the work we are doing, and if you wish to help us spread the message of Americanism contained in THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, then please contribute to our "Distribution Fund" to help finance these free sample copies.

Just make your check out to The Independent American, 7314 Zimpel St., New Orleans, La.

Bigger Government Smaller the People

(Advertisement by Warner & Swazey of Cleveland, placed in leading magazines.)

Everybody -- labor union member, farmer, veteran, shipowner, road builder, importer, sheep herder -- everybody seems to want special "benefits" from the government. So they demand help, and get a law or regulation. That requires a bureau to enforce it, taxes to pay for it.

That is how Washington bureaucracy has grown to more than 2,000,000 and taxes have grown ruinously high.

Laws and regulations are written by government employes, and Americans are being drowned in laws they don't understand, bureaus they can't grasp, taxes they cannot afford.

Self-reliance (another name for self-respect) is like a muscle -- unused, it soon becomes flabby. Our enemies know it, count on it. That is why every time we ask government for something instead of doing it ourselves, we surrender, we lose another bit of America.

NEW PARTY

New Hope for Conservatives

BY DAN SMOOT

The popular vote in the 1960 presidential election came closer to being a tie than the vote in any other presidential election in our history.

If we had--as we did not, and never have had--a complete tabulation of votes for third parties, states rights groups, independent electors, and protest write-in votes--it would be dramatically obvious that John F. Kennedy goes to the Presidency with a distinct majority of the American people against his program of international socialism....

I sincerely hope that no Americans regret the protest votes they cast this year. Those votes were not 'lost'. They give proof that we can, and will, win national elections when we completely reject all candidates in any way tainted with me-tooism and replace them with men who refuse to make any compromise with principle.

This can be done by 1964.

After Barry Goldwater--by refusing to fight for his principles in Chicago, and by trying, unsuccessfully, to swing his conservative supporters to Nixon--led the very vigorous conservative movement up a blind alley and then blackjacked it, I began advising a protest movement as the only means of accomplishing something for our cause in 1960. Again and again, in this "Report", and on my broadcasts, I said, in effect:

"We cannot save this republic by voting for either Nixon or Kennedy. But if conservatives would show that they do not support either one, while at the same time electing the best possible Congress, then whichever one goes to Washington would be handicapped in furthering the programs which were conceived by communists in government during the Roosevelt era and inaugurated as post-war policies before the end of World War II."

It gives me great optimism to observe now that American constitutional conservatives did, to a very significant degree, what I hoped they would do. We didn't elect a fine Congress, but we elected one distinctly better than the late and not lamented 86th Congress; and we elected to the Presidency a man who admits that he does not have the American people behind him -- who acknowledges that he does not have a "popular mandate" to enact the program of international new dealism which he promised.

All real conservatives were against both Nixon and Kennedy; and most agree with me that a very close popular vote would, in any event, be more wholesome and hopeful for our cause than a smashing victory for either one. Many conservatives still feel, however, that it would have been better if Nixon had squeaked through to victory rather than Kennedy. I do not think so.

During the campaign, I said repeatedly, in effect:

"Kennedy is a personification of everything American constitutionalists want to get out of Washington. But he probably would manage to get less of the socialistic program enacted than Nixon would. There would be militant, organized resistance to every Kennedy proposal. Nixon, offering virtually the same proposals, but disguising them with vague and insincere language that sounds conservative, would not stimulate the same determined resistance. Nixon would probably get more of the international socialist programs enacted than Kennedy, because there would not be the same widespread fear of Nixon as of Kennedy."

I still feel the same way about it.

I did not--could not--support Kennedy. I am first, last, and always against voting for evil--regardless of any considerations of political strategy or expediency....

Widescale registration of voters by big union organizations accounted for many Democratic votes. Lodge's stupid (if not cynically planned) campaign on civil rights, including a promise to put a negro in the cabinet, swung many votes away from Republicans. Nixon's failure to carry New York, even after his sellout to Rockefeller who was supposed to be able to deliver the New York vote, has led many astute observers to believe that Rockefeller wanted Kennedy to win. Rockefeller helped give Nixon the nomination, because he wanted to keep a conservative from getting it. This theory implies that Rockefeller knew a genuine, hard-fighting, uncompromising Republican conservative could have won the presidential election in 1960; and that was the last thing Rockefeller wanted.

If that is what Rockefeller thought, he was right. Any conservative Republican fighting for constitutional principles with half the vigor and positive self-assurance that Kennedy brought to his fight for new-dealism, could have won over the Democrats in 1960.

THE TASK AHEAD

The one thing which the 1960 elections revealed, above all else, is that there is a latent, growing, determined, ready-to-be-mobilized conservative strength in the American public. If we will start now--or, rather, keep going with accelerated speed--we can enlarge that strength and have it mobilized by 1964; and it will be great enough to win....

Our first task is to arouse ten million Americans. How? By exposing others to the facts and ideas that aroused us!

On the political front, constitutional conservatives should begin now planning for the 1962 by-elections and the 1964 general elections. Don't wait for someone else to start a national movement. Don't wait for some prominent national figure to tell you how to plan and organize in your district. Start by talking with acquaintances who share your conservative convictions. If, after discussion, you think both Republican and Democrat parties are so controlled that it would be impossible for your people to get a good candidate in either, then try to find a good local lawyer with conservative convictions to investigate the election laws of your state, with a view to finding out what you must do to form a third party.

After you find out, start trying to do it, regardless of how difficult it may seem. The worst you can do is fail. But even in failure you may have success. An organized effort to form a political party for constitutional conservatives will itself become an educational, and morale-building activity. It will give folks something to do, and give them hope, and keep them discussing the ideas of freedom.

There are in every district in America enough well-informed conservatives to start such political activity as I have suggested. With dedication and determination they can create enough political interest and organization to have a profound effect on the Congressional elections of 1962. That would be the impetus and springboard for coordinated national effort, determined to get a political party for conservatives qualified and on the ballot in every state by 1964.

If that basic groundwork were done, locally, the proper men to lead the movement nationally would appear. On this score, one word of caution: constitutional conservatives should never try to play the game of political expediency. Republicans and Democrats are brilliantly organized for that game. We can win only by uncompromising adherence to principle--which includes rejecting the leadership of any person, regardless of how prominent or promising, who has ever, for any reason whatever, betrayed or compromised our principles and our cause.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The above represents only a few excerpts from the very excellent DAN SMOOT REPORT of November 21, 1960, entitled "A Time For Hope". If you wish a copy of this entire article, prices are: one copy - 25¢, 6 for $1.00. Regular subscription rates for THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a weekly newsletter, are $10.00 a year; $6.00 for 6 months; $3.00 for 3 months. Address: THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas.)

RIGHT WING EDITORIALS WANTED

Patriots, please send us right-wing, patriotic editorials which may appear in your local newspapers. However, please do not mark on them with pencil or crayon, as all newspaper editorials are reproduced in THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN by a photographic process.

"Rigged" High School Debates

How One-Worlders Try to "Brainwash" America's Youth

Phoebe Courtney, Editor

The radical internationalists are using the National High School Debates this year, to further promote world government propaganda in the nation's schools. The proposition upon which students are asked to debate is:

"How can the Security of the Free World Best Be Maintained?"

(1) RESOLVED: that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should be transformed into a Federal Government.

(2) RESOLVED: that the United Nations should be significantly strengthened.

(3) RESOLVED: that the United States should initiate a Federal World Government.

LEFT WINGERS GAG OPPOSITION

Official debate instructions are furnished students through the "Debate Handbook" published by the Mid-West Debate Bureau of Normal, Illinois.

In their instructions to young debaters the promoters of these high school debates have resorted to underhanded and specious debate tactics in order to prevent the opposition from discussing the full facts regarding the United Nations and world government.

For example, the bottom of page 24 of the "Debate Handbook," describes the following statement as "a negative fallacy":

"The people of the United States should avoid any and all attempts of the radical internationalists to entangle our nation in any type of federal world government or any combination of the NATO nations into a government since such a proposal is Communistic and will lead our democratic nation to destruction."

The above statement represents the view of the MAJORITY of patriotic American citizens. However, the world government promoters term this statement not only a "negative fallacy," but describe it as "name-calling," and "an appeal to prejudice."

Americans wishing to retain national sovereignty for the United States are given no opportunity to advocate their position.

On page 85 of the "Debate Handbook" there is the sentence:

"By the term 'a federal world government' we mean a government including all of the nations of the world. This federal world government would have powers over all nations similar to those that the United States now has over its people. It could levy taxes, establish tariffs and customs or abolish them, maintain an army...."

The leftwing handbook, on page 92, admits that this proposed federal world government would levy a graduated income tax, and further admits:

"We in the United States would be paying much higher taxes' (to the federal world government) than would be paid by the people of other countries."

Thus we see that American citizens under any form of world government would have to pay local, City, State, and Federal - plus WORLD GOVERNMENT TAXES!

On page 135, the "Debate Handbook" states:

"It would be possible for Russia to join a federal world government and still retain Communism within her own borders."

The leftwing handbook specifically omits the fact that the Soviet Union now is the dominating influence in the United Nations. In any federal world government with the Soviet Union a member, this Communist domination would not only continue, but would intensify.

The handbook then states:

"The creation of a federal world government would contribute directly to the establishment of the rights of man in all areas."

The handbook neglects, however, to point out that this statement is in direct contradiction to their statement that Russia would maintain Communism within her borders, because the fact is that no Russian citizen has any rights -- nor will he ever, under Communism.

BEWARE U.N. PROPAGANDA

The United World Federalists are also distributing their literature to high school debaters throughout the nation. In a recent pamphlet entitled "How to Give the United Nations the Power to Enforce World Peace Through World Law" distributed by the United World Federalists, Inc., is included a section entitled "Safeguards Against Abuse of U. N. Power." The mere use of such a title is clear indication that those concerned with the drafting of the U.N. Charter, subsequent covenants, resolutions, etc., realize that an increasing number of American citizens are becoming aware of the dangers the U.N. poses to the sovereignty of the United States through "abuse" of U.N. power.

In an effort to counter mounting criticism of the U.N., this leftwing propaganda booklet suggests that the United Nations Charter be revised so that it "would insure that each law-abiding nation would have complete internal sovereignty to manage its domestic affairs." The mere fact that the U.N. Charter would have to be "revised" in order to make this so-called "guarantee" is clear indication that jurisdiction over domestic affairs in the United States is NOW in jeopardy!

This high-sounding declaration, calculated to calm the fears of American citizens, is exposed for its phoniness several paragraphs later in the same article, which brazenly states that "an amendment process must be included in the Charter so that orderly change can take place if experience proves it necessary, and a heavily preponderant majority approves." Obviously this latter statement completely cancels out the first statement, which supposedly protects domestic sovereignty. Under the U.N. "amendment process" and manipulating a "heavily preponderant majority" composed in large part of African and Asian nations, it would be a simple matter indeed for the U.N. to vote to destroy the national sovereignty of the United States!

Despite propaganda put out by the United World Federalists, the American Association for the United Nations, the U. S. State Department, etc., all of which promote the United Nations, the fact remains that the ultimate purpose and aim of the U.N. is to obtain control over all affairs of the United States - financial, foreign and domestic.

In proof of this, Mr. Frank Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, recently stated:

"In April, 1949, Mr. Moses Moskowitz, an official of one of the consultative organizations of the United Nations, publicly stated (35 ABAJ 285) that under the official view of the United Nations, any matter once becoming the subject of a U.N. convention, or even of a resolution, ceased to be a 'matter essentially within the jurisdiction of a member State.' In other words, the U.N., by its own ipse dixit could internationalize a purely domestic matter so that it lost its character as a domestic matter . . . Upon this theory, the U. N. could lift itself by its bootstraps into a world government."

President-Elect Kennedy has pledged his full support to the United Nations, and is completely in favor of "strengthening the U.N." which, of course, can only result in world government.

If you wish more information on the National High School Debates, plus a documented expose of Communist control of the United Nations, send $1.00 for 20 copies of TAX FAX No. 26, entitled " 'Rigged' High School Debates Promote World Government." Single copies, 25¢. Order your TAX FAX pamphlets today from THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans, 18, Louisiana.

In order that the high school students in your area can have the facts at hand in order to defeat the one-worlders in these high school debates, copies of TAX FAX No. 26 should be placed in the hands of all high school students in your community.

The Dangerous Illusion of Disarmament

BY EDITH KERMIT ROOSEVELT

Perhaps the most pressing problem the new administration must face is the related question of disarmament negotiations and nuclear testing.

This was pointed out by Thomas E. Murray, former atomic energy commissioner, who warned in an open letter to both presidential candidates, that unless we resume underground tests of nuclear weapons at once the Kremlin may beat us in developing the neutron bomb. In this case, he believes, we would be faced with the choice of surrender or annihilation.

While there may not be conclusive proof that the U.S.S.R. has conducted clandestine tests there is plenty of reason to suspect they have -- including press reports of the mysterious shift in the Soviet earthquake pattern.

In the light of the record of broken promises and Soviet treachery can we afford to take a chance on the Soviets abiding by its honor moratorium?

Part of the reason we allowed ourselves to be maneuvered into this dangerous moratorium with no enforceable inspection system was due to the arms-security negotiations which in themselves helped to create a psychology of world-wide fear. Yet the idea that a disarmament pact would be a key to peace is a sorry illusion for several reasons:

(1) The increased complexity of modern weapons systems. New scientific discoveries and their technological applications constantly upset whatever control and inspection systems might be established.

(2) The second obstacle is the absence of an adequate system of world law. While the phrase "world peace through world law" has a fine ring to it, the fact is the governments of the world do not yet subscribe to a common set of social and ethical values. Even the United Nations has been unable to agree on definitions covering all forms of international "aggression"--much less find ways to cope with them.

(3) The third obstacle to international arms control is the unequal capabilities of Western and Communist blocs. If organized military power is reduced, the West would be left increasingly at the mercy of those conspiratorial and guerilla techniques which chiefly account for the striking advances of Communism.

The problem of arms control is not the same for the Soviets as ourselves. The Communists have easy access to our open society and hence can verify our compliance with a disarmament pact. We do not have like access to their totalitarian state.

By its very nature as a bureaucratic organization, any control commission would be subject to political pressure applied to selected members. The movement of inspectors could be interfered with; decoy methods used; detection apparatus tampered with; communications can be cut or falsified and the corps of inspectors infiltrated. While some of these tactics would be detected, others might remain hidden.

Violations of the control system on either side would aggravate international tensions. But the danger to the United States is that should the Soviet Union violate the agreement we would be reluctant to take the required counterstep. We would be told that "world opinion" preferred "some sort of inspection" to the "arms race" and that "little violations" would not justify canceling the agreement.

Yet the experience of the 30's shows that it is not the arms race that leads to war but rather international disarmament discussions and pacts which foster pacifist illusions that sap the political will of democracies.

Prior to World War II we entered into arms limitation agreements with Japan. The United States lived up to these agreements and disarmed unilaterally. On the other hand, Japan took advantage of these treaties to secretly advance its strategic interests in the Far East and prepare for its surprise attack on us.

COPYRIGHT 1960 by Edith Kermit Roosevelt Syndicate, 403 E. 77th St., New York 21, N.Y.

'For an Opposition Party . . .'

As one of the nation's staunchest advocates of states' rights, Tom Anderson, editor and publisher of Farm and Ranch Magazine (circulation more than 1,300,000) has outlined his philosophy by compiling a list of objectives—a list of things he's FOR.

Adherents to the cause of states' rights will find themselves seconding Mr. Anderson's stand. Here are excerpts from Mr. Anderson's editorial, "Straight Talk," in the November issue of Farm and Ranch:

"I'm for J. Edgar Hoover, who can catch Communists faster than the Supreme Court can turn 'em loose. For an upward reach of our nation toward more spiritual values and morality, starting at the Presidential level. For spending whatever it takes to protect America from attack, from without and from within.

"I'm for the right to vote, without regard to race or age, for all citizens who can pass an intelligence test proving they've earned the right to vote. For a law requiring that the number of federal agricultural employes shall not exceed the total number of farmers. For outlawing the Communist Party and jailing or deporting all known Communists, including those in our State Department. . . .

"For everybody standing up and being counted: teachers, doctors, lawyers, businessmen, even to face the catastrophe of catastrophes, "it hurts business." For killing the Agricultural Act of 1938 as amended, setting the farmer free. For taxing coops like corporations.

"For Sammy Davis Jr., as the first space man. For nuclear war in preference to slavery. For Africa—for Africans. For iris, daffodils, old limestone fences, ivy-covered brick, sunbathing, old brick, wood fireplaces, the Golden Rule.

"I'm for Senator Kennedy, the Roosevelts, Soapy Williams, Adlai Stevenson, Nelson Rockefeller, Averill Harriman and other super-rich - by - inheritance, built - in-guilt-complex do-gooders sharing their own wealth, not mine. For an opposition party, regardless of whether Socialist Party A or Socialist Party B wins the election.

"For winning the Cold War, not ending it. I'm for Earl Warren for impeachment. For right-to-work without being forced to join a union. For repeal of the 16th Amendment (the federal personal income tax). For the inequality of man, since equal men are not free and free men are not equal. For education bought, paid for and controlled locally. For more expensive teachers and less expensive school buildings. For separation of Church and State. For the right of a businessman to run his business without being dictated to by a labor union. . . .

"For limiting all federal officeholders to one term so our federal employes can become our servants instead of masters, making honest mistakes instead of calculated ones.

"For people who so live that they can look any accuser in the eye and tell him to go to hell. For losing a cause that's right instead of winning with a cause that's wrong. For the House Un-American Activities Committee. For trading with people and companies who are for America, for the Constitution and for capitalism. . . .

"For all the millions of American boys whose daddies will never be able to buy them the presidency. For a 'New Frontier' for Cyrus Eaton, in Russia. For tightening law enforcement to prevent the production, transportation, and sale of obscene literature, photographs, movies, records and TV programs. For boycotting bookstores, TV and radio networks, druestores and newsstands which handle the filth.

"For curbing the Supreme Court, balancing the budget, limiting the debt. . . . For the Connally Amendment. . . ."

(Reprinted from SHREVEPORT (La.) JOURNAL)

MORE PROOF

The oft-repeated claim that U. S. Foreign Aid helps to strengthen the Free World against Communism was disproven by the recent vote in the United Nations to place the admission of Red China on the U.N. agenda.

In the United Nations vote on Red China, 42 nations voted with the United States to keep Red China out, and 34 nations voted with the Soviet Union to admit Red China to the United Nations.

Our Foreign Aid program since the end of World War II has given $8,851,000,000 to 25 of the 34 countries who voted against us and on the side of the Soviet Union to admit Red China to the United Nations.

These nations voted, in effect, for complete control of the United Nations by the Communist bloc of nations. They voted AGAINST American freedom and independence.

The UN is supposed to be an organization devoted to peace and prevention of aggression. Yet it considers membership for the world's most active aggressor, which at the time of consideration was occupying Tibet and a portion of Northern India.

Yugoslavia, which had received $2,132,000,000 in Foreign Aid, voted to admit Red China to the United Nations. India, which has received $2,265,000,000 in Foreign Aid, also voted with the Soviet Union.

The U.S. Foreign Aid Program, which both President-Elect Kennedy and Vice President Nixon indicated during the recent presidential campaign that they would increase, has proven a dismal failure in buying friendship for the United States.

Only a strong United States, devoted to preserving our independence, can win the respect of the world and protect our Constitutional form of government.

KENNEDY'S ADVISOR - GALBRAITH

(Reprinted from THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR)

John Kenneth Galbraith wrote a book not long ago called "The Affluent Society." His theme was that America is beset by too much private wealth in the midst of too much public squalor.

Galbraith said on a television interview the other night that he favors changing the entire structure of American society. The present structure, of course, is one devoted to individual freedom and private enterprise.

Galbraith is a professor of economics who is credited with being one of the brain-trusters behind the Reuther-Bowles platform foisted on the Democratic Party at Los Angeles.

A supporter is quoted as having said, "The choice . . . is whether we are going to continue our present rush toward that classical condition of private opulence and public deterioration, which always has marked the decline of an empire."

The fact is, empires from the Roman to the British have always declined when *governments* became too big, paternalistic and wasteful, putting more faith in bureaucracy than in individual private initiative. Our own nation was founded in revolt against a central government which pretended to know what was best for everybody.

Reduced to essentials, Galbraith's contention is that people as individuals should be required to surrender more of their money to the Federal government to finance Washington's economic and social planning. To support this idea, he argues that people as individuals are too "affluent" or, as others have interpreted it, "opulent."

What most Americans are thoroughly justified in asking is, who is so doggoned opulent?

Most of the people we know aren't doing much more than meeting the monthly bills, including the mortgage payments. Sure, they have more money to do it with—but the bills are bigger, too. Bills more than take up the extra cash. That's what inflation has done.

These "affluent" people Galbraith is talking about aren't some other people—they're you. They're the working people in the factories and stores and offices. They're the farmers and salesmen and stock clerks. In short, they are the people whose paychecks are now nicked for the biggest part of government funds, and whose pay checks will be nicked even deeper every time government spending for some welfare scheme is increased.

The "affluence" Galbraith wants to curtail among the American people is your affluence—for whatever it is worth. Putting aside all the fine words, he is saying you should be required to pay more of your earnings into taxes so the government can spend more money and you must spend less.

On this theme, the executive vice-chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability and Economic Growth, W. Allen Wallis, recently had this to say: "The public squalor argument is, in fact, simply this decade's battle cry of socialism, which—intellectually bankrupt over more than a century of seeing one after another of its arguments for socializing the means of production demolished — now seeks to socialize the results of production."

What he means is, they want to socialize your wages into their pockets.

Political Paradoxes

(Reprinted from Charleston (S.C.) NEWS & COURIER)

As a reporter of national politics Earl Mazo of the New York Herald Tribune has access to much information that escapes us in the provinces. We note with interest and respect his comments in a speech at Columbia on the recent election. He said the South lost an opportunity to unite and call the turn of the election. He also pointed to a paradox wherein the Democrats appealed to Southerners to vote Democratic and "keep the South in the saddle," at the same time that they advised Northerners to vote Democratic and "kick the South out of the saddle."

Mr. Mazo posed something of a paradox of his own when he praised to the skies the political leadership of Gov. E. F. Hollings. While sharing Mr. Mazo's glowing affection for Mr. Hollings as a person,

The News and Courier feels obliged to point out that it was Mr. Hollings, along with almost all the other Southern office-holders, who supplied the leadership that kept the South in the Democratic bag and thereby sacrificed the opportunity that Mr. Mazo says was available to call the turn of the election.

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."
--Edmund Burke

THE TROUGH IS CROWDED

(Reprinted from the Alexandria, La., TOWN-TALK)

There are almost as many government civilian employes (federal, state and local) as are employed by the country's 500 largest corporations. One out of every seven employed persons is working for government, according to a Tax Foundation study.

It costs roughly $33 billion today to support the payrolls covering the 8 million government workers, 2.3 million of them in federal jobs and 5.8 million on state and local payrolls.

And it probably will get worse before we see any improvement. Tax Foundation expects the number of government employes to reach 10 million within the next decade.

The American On The Court

(Reprinted from THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR)

The choice of Philip C. Jessup to sit as a judge on the International Court of Justice adds an odd twist to the persistent campaign to bring about repeal of the Connally Reservation. This is the brief amendment by which the U.S. reserves the right to determine whether a disputed matter is essentially domestic and not subject to World Court Jurisdiction.

The World Court has 15 members, and traditionally one of them is an American. The judges are elected technically as individuals, rather than as representatives of nations. The electing is done by the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council. Nominations are made by legal advisory panels of the various nations. Some of the other groups nominated the present American on the court, Judge Green H. Hackworth, for re-election, but the American panel passed him up and proposed Jessup. Hackworth subsequently withdrew.

Part of the controversy over the Connally Reservation revolves around the point of the individuality—as opposed to the nationality—of the judges. It is naive to expect any Communist official to act officially as anything but a representative of his own Communist nation and the Communist conspiracy. There are two Communist judges on the present court.

It follows that the American judge on the court is expected to view cases in the light of American precepts of law. This expectation has formed one of the arguments used by opponents of the Connally Reservation. They have pointed out that there is an American on the court to present the American view, and to protect against any court action which might intrude into American domestic affairs or do violence to the U.S. Constitution. This point is used to buttress the argument that the World Court can safely be trusted to make its own determination of the line between international affairs and domestic affairs.

In the light of all this, we should have thought that those with the power of choice in their hands would have sought, as the American on the court, a staunch and outspoken protagonist of American constitutionalism. In particular we'd expect a man who would inspire confidence among those conservative Americans fighting to keep the Connally Reservation.

Philip Jessup is not such a man. Throughout his career his dominant field has been international law. This is a sterling attribute for a judge on an international bench, but other qualities do not recommend him as the man who is to be relied on as an advocate of the American Constitution.

He was chairman of the Pacific Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, in the period when that organization was under intense fire for its leftward leanings.

He was assistant secretary general of the Bretton Woods conference and was a member of the United States delegation to the meeting at San Francisco in which the U.N. was formed. In these enterprises he was closely associated with Alger Hiss, who was convicted of perjury. Jessup was a character witness for Hiss when Hiss was tried on charges of lying.

Jessup was senior advisor to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and was editor of Acheson's white paper on the role of the United States in the loss of China to the Reds.

Jessup's loyalty was challenged twice by Senate subcommittees. In the first challenge he was cleared. As a result of the second he was denied Senate confirmation of an appointment as delegate to the United Nations.

We do not see how a man with his history, however competent he may be in the field of international law, can be expected to represent the United States or American constitutional law on the bench of the World Court.

Conservatives no doubt will now intensify their battle to preserve the Connally Reservation so that the U.S. retains clear power to keep domestic matters out of the World Court.

"Official" Brainwash

(Reprinted from Charleston, S.C. NEWS & COURIER)

The American Assembly, a supposedly non-partisan group of scholars, businessmen and public officials, has recommended that the U.S. State Department be given funds to sell its views to the U.S. public.

In its final report, the Assembly said the State Department "should make more effort and have more funds to inform the public about the major issues of foreign policy and the requirements of its proper execution. It is unwise, particularly when foreign dictators have access to our own mass media, to put limits on the ability of the Department of State to keep the American people informed about foreign policies and programs."

The News and Courier believes that this recommendation should be firmly rejected by Congress. In the first place, federal agencies should not be furnished money so they can sell the taxpayers on a course of action.

If the State Department wants to reach the public, all it has to do is call in the reporters. But the State Department isn't eager for the press to investigate its operations. It still conceals the full story of who turned Cuba over to Castro. For that matter the entire record of State's giveaway of China to the communists is hidden from public view. And the Yalta papers have never been released in their entirety.

Had the State Department the funds two years ago that the American Assembly now recommends, one may be sure that Castro's apologists in Washington would have spent lavishly to promote the idea that the Cuban revolutionary was Robin Hood.

(Editor's note: The American Assembly is a semi-secret group controlled by Eastern Liberals prominent in the fields of industry and banking, who first infiltrated and then took over the policy-making decisions of both the Democrat and the Republican parties. "Modern Republicanism" was born at meetings of the American Assembly in 1954. The purpose of the American Assembly meetings is to "brainwash" carefully-chosen businessmen from all sections of the country who attend these "seminars" and are given the red-carpet treatment as they are indoctrinated in ideologies whose aim is to destroy the free enterprise system. These gullible businessmen, so flattered at being selected to attend a "seminar" of the American Assembly, are apparently unaware that it was the Soviet mastermind, Lenin, who cynically said: "When the final conquest of the United States is in sight, there are some industrialists in the U.S. who will bid for the rope contract"!

IMAGINARY RIFTS

(Reprinted from THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR)

We do not expect any serious rift between Moscow and Peiping. Both Communist states follow one and the same policy—world conquest and the destruction of the "capitalist" way of life, which, in practice, means the destruction of the United States. Mao and Khrushchev may from time to time have their differences concerning the ways and means of achieving their purpose. But they are united on all important issues, and particularly in their Communist hatred of the United States—they both want to bury us and bury us quickly. If we want to follow a realistic policy toward the Communist danger, we should stop kidding ourselves about imaginary rifts and quarrels between Moscow and Peiping. Nikita and Mao are members of the same gang and they should be treated alike—as equally deadly and equally dangerous enemies of the United States and of everything that the American people stand for.

How Much Is Really Owed?

At a dinner held by the Tax Foundation in New York, Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget, undertook to answer that question. "Fact No. 3," he said, "is that our present national debt of $290 billion doesn't include present Federal liabilities for past services in even greater amounts . . . Now the $290 billion of current public debt, plus $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion in C.O.D.'s adds to the almost incredible total of about $750 billion. That is the Federal Government's mortgage on America's future, beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and commerce."

Against that background, the promises made by Senator Kennedy in the course of the campaign and the response of those who heard him would seem to confirm Bishop Butler's theory—quoted in the introduction to Andrew D. White's book, "Fiat Money Inflation in France"—that nations, like individuals can indeed become insane.

DANGEROUS TRENDS

(Reprinted from THE STATE, Columbia, S. C.)

"I say this with all the sincerity of which I am capable: If we undermine our fundamental principles, and impair our fiscal solvency in the next 25 to 30 years as we have in the past quarter century, I cannot believe our democracy will survive." So says Senator Harry Flood Byrd, writing for the Committee of Constitutional Government under the title "Dangerous Trends."

The stalwart Virginian has long battled for the principles on which this republic was founded, and his words seem particularly apt at this juncture in our history.

He further points out that "our strength is being sapped by the paternalism of Federal bureaucracy grown too big, usurpation of power by the Supreme Court grown too mighty, and force of labor leaders grown too arrogant."

Supreme Court decisions, reaching a peak in judicial usurpation of power, he declares, have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded state sovereignty, interfered with Federal executive authority and usurped the powers of Congress. By a vote of 38 to 6, the chief justices of State Supreme Courts adopted a report by 10 eminent jurists, based on an intensive study of recent decisions on Federal-State relationships, which urged the Supreme Court to restrain itself in the exercise of vast power.

The two greatest foundation stones of our form of government, the Senator thinks, are individual liberty and State sovereignty. They are the strongest deterrents to centralized government which leads to socialism.

Looking to the future, against the background of trends the past 30 years, only eight being war years, 16 peacetime deficits. In the 22 years of peace the Federal debt increase has averaged more than $2 billion a year, being now above $286 billion.

At the same time federal agencies have increased 100 per cent; federal employes 300 per cent; federal debt 1,700 per cent; federal tax collections 1,800 per cent, and federal expenditures 2,300 per cent.

Senator Byrd suggests that it is up to all who believe in our system to fight for progress without destroying the fundamental principles of our government which, in a short period of time, have made us the greatest Nation in the world.

We agree.

Riddle

Rep. Richard H. Poff (Rep., Va.) has a riddle.

What kind of financial shape is a man in if he has an income of $7,000 a year, but has a debt of $29,000 of which $5,000 is payable on demand and $7,000 more is due within the year?

He's in a mess, isn't he?

But don't criticize too hastily, Rep. Poff suggests. For if you add seven zeroes to those figures in each case, you will have exactly the situation the Federal Government of the United States is in right now.

No Matter What Label

(Reprinted from the Kemmerer, (Wyo.) GAZETTE)

The American people are constantly told that a way to combat the Communist menace is to turn over more and more power, to say nothing of more and more of their wealth, to a super-state. If the people allow that to happen, there will be small need of combatting communism--for we will simply adopt a communism of our own, no matter what label is given to it.

Usurpation

James Madison said it in a speech in the Virginia Convention on June 16, 1788, but it is quite timely today:

Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."

Planned Depression

(Reprinted from the WALL STREET JOURNAL)

Those who look to Washington to uplift "depressed areas" often point proudly to the Tennessee Valley Authority as the land-mark example of prosperity through government planning.

U.S. taxpayers certainly have provided enough money to develop the valley -- $1.5 billion over the past 27 years -- but the results hardly bear out the theory that government can work miracles. Quite the contrary.

Rep. Bow of Ohio has got up an illuminating list of "depressed areas" now in need of federal aid. Seventy of Tennessee's 95 counties are included, and some of the worst distress is smack in the middle of TVA country. Mississippi's only TVA county is among the depressed. So are three of six TVA counties in Kentucky and six of nine in Alabama.

Government, it would seem, not only can't guarantee prosperity, but may actually plan its wards into depression.

U. S. Finances Own Destruction Through U. N.

BY ALICE WIDENER

Can America afford to let down its defense?

No.

Can America afford to continue world aid to the poor?

No.

Who persuaded us to try to extend world aid to the poor?

Mostly a group of propagandists in the United Nations Secretariat among whom not a single one is dedicated to the free market economy and to the competitive, private, free enterprise system.

Though these U.N. propagandists describe themselves variously, they are, in fact, socialists of one kind or another. They preach that world peace can be brought about through world socialism. They promise: "Give us the tools and we'll do the job."

The tools, of course, are United States dollars. And there is absolutely no limit to the amount of dollars the United Nations wants to spend.

Constantly, Americans are told, "The United States pays less than a third of the U.N. budget." This statement is deceptive in the extreme. The United States is assessed a fraction less than a third of the regular United Nations administrative budget; but the United States regularly pays at least forty per cent of the cost of many U.N. activities and often as high as sixty and eighty per cent.

THE COST OF CONGO

The present crisis in the Congo is a perfect example of how the United Nations puts an extra load on the U.S. dollar.

On October 21, The New York Times reported "U.N. FACING CRISIS ON COSTS IN CONGO." and "MAY ASK FOR U.S. TO PAY HALF OF PROGRAM, WHICH WILL NEED 150 MILLION BY END OF '61."

Further on in this news report, there is the statement that "conservative" estimate puts the Congo cost at somewhere between 150 and 200 million before 1962. This report goes on to state, "Since the Soviet bloc has indicated that it will refuse to pay any part of the cost of the United Nations Congo program, it is generally agreed that the United States will have to pay at least half."

Now--half of 200 million contributed to the U.N. for its Congo adventure amounts to many millions more than the total regular U.N. annual administrative budget! So--when U.N. propagandists tell Americans they pay "only a third" of the cost of the U.N., they are guilty of withholding material information.

Today, the money available to the Eisenhower Administration is insufficient for subsidy of the U.N. Congo adventure. The next Congress will "have to" make emergency appropriations for the U.N.

Also, there are now and will be other appropriations for the U.N. For example, the United Nations Emergency Force in Egypt costs $200,000,000. The United States pays 48.5 per cent of the total. Unless more U.S. dollars are poured into maintenance of the UNEF, it will be withdrawn.

To get back to the Congo situation: The United Nations wants to raise a $100,000,000 fund "to support the Congolese Government."

At this point it becomes necessary to ask "What Congolese government?" As things look at this time of writing, it will be a Patrice-Lumumba-Soviet-Government, because the United Nations, practicing its "neutral supervision," is hamstrung by Ghana-Guinea and Red intrigues, and is preventing pro-Western, anti-Soviet Congolese leaders from exercising any kind of effective control over the situation in the Congo.

People who talk about the size of U.S. contributions to the U.N. rarely have at hand a set of reliable figures. They are duped by professional propagandists unwilling to define what they mean by "the U.N." Actually, the only realistic way to define the United Nations is to say "the U.N. and all its specialized agencies and the U.N.-directed activities."

WE PAY 80%

To gain a better estimate of the load imposed by the U.N. on the U.S. dollar, it is enlightening to study the latest figures for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency which extends aid to the Arab refugees from Palestine. Since 1950, the United States has contributed more than a quarter of a billion dollars to UNRWA. On October 20, Senator George D. Aiken announced a further U.S. contribution of $23,000,000 toward a total of $29,487,500. Is this U.S. contribution "less than a third" or is it 80 per cent? And how about the total figure of $273,000,000? Doesn't this represent about $1.60 for every man, woman and child in the United States, counting a population of 170,000,000?

WE PAY 100%

Take a very small item--the cost of an airlift of U.N. Forces to the Congo. The tab came to $13,000,000, entirely paid for by the United States. If other trouble spots requiring U.N. airlifts should occur in Africa, Asia and Latin America, would the U.N. load the brunt of the cost on the U.S. dollar?

SOVIET PAYS NOTHING

Certainly none of the cost will be loaded on the Russian ruble. Why? Because the Soviets won't even glance at the tab for the U.N. Congo Forces, or for the U.N. Relief and Works Agency. Moreover, 68 out of the 99 members of the United Nations refuse to contribute to UNRWA. These 68 nations--which include the entire Soviet bloc and all Latin-American countries--simply will not give a penny to help a million poverty-stricken Arab refugees; yet all 68 clamor in the General Assembly that they passionately believe in "world brotherhood" and in wiping out poverty and human suffering everywhere.

ARE WE TO PAY MORE?

On the same day that Senator Aiken informed the U.N. General Assembly that the U.S. dollar was loaded with 80 per cent of the cost of UNRWA, former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge made a political campaign speech in Minneapolis calling for expansion of four United Nations activities--Technical Assistance, the Special Fund, World Bank and International Development Association. Mr. Lodge also called for an economic planning bureau to be established at the U.N.

How will the cost of such expansion be met? By another U.N. load on the U.S. dollar?

BANKROLLER?

On October 24 the New York Daily News carried an editorial "15 YEARS OF THE U.N." which stated, "The United States was one of the prime movers in setting up the United Nations. This country ever since has been the U.N.'s biggest single bankroller... That's all very high-minded and idealistic; but we'd better look sharp from now on, lest we find some day that we've been the chief creator of a Frankenstein monster."

UTOPIAN TRAGEDY

It is extremely difficult to persuade people deluded by professional U.N. propagandists of the fact that sincere and well-informed critics of the United Nations are not low-minded and without ideals. Millions and millions of dollars have been expended in the United States to convince the American people that the United Nations is "the last best hope for peace," and that American money is better spent by the United Nations than by the United States.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that the only war the American people have been called on to wage since 1945, when the U.N. came into existence, was the United Nations War Without Victory in Korea.

General Douglas MacArthur said that the United States would pay for its mistakes in the Korean War for a thousand years. Though we have paid billions and billions for those mistakes in the last seven years since the so-called "armistice," we have not yet begun to pay the real price.

What will the U.N. Congo Adventure cost us? Nobody knows. Will the U.N. try to depict defeat there as success? How much responsibility does the United Nations Department of Trusteeship Council and Non-Self-Governing Territories Affairs bear for the original difficulties which arose in the Congo between the Congolese and the Belgians? And how about other U.N.-hatched troubles in Africa? And also in Asia and Latin America?

It is true that in some strictly humanitarian endeavors the United Nations has accomplished much good. Unfortunately, a great deal of the good-will credit for this good goes to U.N. Member States which are members of the Soviet bloc, though they contribute almost nothing to these endeavors. In all of them, most of the charitable load falls on the U.S. dollar and, ironically, there is now danger of what Leslie Gould and other financial experts call "a run on the dollar" by some recipients of this charity.

THE BACK-BREAKER

In all the U.N. load on the U.S. dollar, the weight of the disastrous U.N. Nationalization Resolution of 1952 probably will prove to be the most crushing. It is impossible to estimate the loss to the United States which has resulted from it. This infamous document gives U.N. moral sanction to violation of the sanctity of international contract, and to the confiscation of private investors' property abroad without prompt, adequate and just compensation.

If the U.N. Nationalization Resolution of 1952 had provided decent protection of property rights to private investors risking capital in a foreign land, then the entire international financial situation would be far different from what it is today. At the time of Nasser's unlawful violation of the Suez contract, Great Britain and France and other investors would have been able to "appeal to the U.N." for redress of wrongs. In this present time of confiscation in Castro's Cuba, American investors would be able to do likewise.

On October 24, the National Foreign Trade Council declared, "The confiscation of U.S.-owned property in Cuba shows complete disregard for property rights as guaranteed by any law-abiding member of the family of nations."

What the National Foreign Trade Council says is correct; but it is unavailing so long as the United Nations Family of Nations refuses to recognize property rights as human rights, as it has done, and refuses to amend the U.N. Nationalization Resolution in such manner as to uphold sanctity of contract in the field of international private and public investment.

The United Nations has been in existence fifteen years. During 1945-1960, the U.N. has put an extremely heavy load on the U.S. dollar. If this load should be greatly increased, it is possible that the American economy would stagger and fall. It is also possible that American taxpayers would be saddled with the heaviest kind of progressive United Nations income tax.

(Editor's note: Alice Widener, publisher of U.S.A. Newsletter, and author of the above article which first appeared in her publication is one of the foremost authorities on the United Nations. U.S.A. Newsletter is published every other week. Address: 829 Park Avenue, New York 21, N. Y. Subscription rates: $20 a year in the U.S.)

Worth Thinking About

Abolish individual income taxes, remove the federal government from competition with private industry and watch the revenue roll in.

That's the rather startling—and appealing—proposal of Rep. Edgar W. Hiestand, California Republican.

At first glance, it sounds like an impossibility. But Rep. Hiestand's plan may provoke some second thoughts.

He says the key to his proposal is a constitutional amendment which would prevent the federal government from engaging "in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

He contends that 20 percent of the industrial capacity of the United States now is operated by federal agencies on an interest free, dividend free, rent free, cost free and tax free basis.

He says the government's investment in its properties is estimated at $262 billion—"almost as colossal as our $286 billion federal debt," says Hiestand.

The Californian contends that if the government sold these properties to private enterprise for even 25 percent of the government's investment and credited the $65 billion thus realized to the national debt "it would save the taxpayers interest charges of almost $2 billion a year."

In addition, Hiestand says, there would be a savings in payroll, facilities, collection costs and the expense of printing tax forms of $44 billion a year.

Using 1959 as an example, the California congressman said the government would have wound up with a surplus of $7 billion, totaling all savings. Individual income tax receipts produced only $37 billion in 1959, he said!

When you start talking about billions of dollars, that comes under the general heading of high finance. The average person has no conception of a billion dollars.

But when anyone mentions the possibility of removing the federal income tax, the average person immediately becomes more than mildly interested.

If someone who knows anything about high finance could be convinced that Rep. Hiestand's proposal is workable, it wouldn't take long for the common man to give the snowball a vigorous push.

(Reprinted from THE STATE JOURNAL of Lansing, Mich.)

Quarantine Castro's Cuba

If the U.S. economic quarantine of Red Cuba is to be successful it must go all the way. It is not enough simply to cut off the flow of industrial supplies from the continental United States to Cuba. The government must enforce the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to require that all foreign subsidiaries of American companies cease selling to Cuba's communist regime.

It would be absurd if an American company with headquarters in New York or Chicago were ordered to halt sales, and its subsidiary in Canada or Brazil were permitted to continue selling. The U.S. government also must make sure there aren't transshipments of industrial materials from regular non-communist customers to Cuba. That's the procedure followed in dealing with Red China. It should have application in the Cuban situation.

(Reprinted from CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS)

"Anyone who claims he can increase a nation's purchasing power by redistributing wealth, juggling the price, manipulating the currency, or by using any other means than labor intelligently applied in production, is either a fakir or a fool."

--John Rustgaard

Turning The Other Cheek

Appeasers in the State Department, seeking to curry favor with left-wing elements in Latin America, recently influenced the U.S. government to break off diplomatic relations with Trujillo's Dominican Republic.

It is ironic indeed that whenever the United States seeks support in the United Nations the chief recipients of our Foreign Aid either refuse to take sides, or vote with the Soviet Union. However, on the crucial issue of admittance of Red China to the U.N., the staunchly anti-Communist Dominican Republic, whom the United States humiliated before the world in our unprecedented and unwarranted breaking off of diplomatic relations, "turned the other cheek" and voted on the side of the United States!

SEND NAMES FOR OUR MAILING LIST

PLEASE SEND ONLY NAMES OF PERSONS WHO YOU THINK WOULD BE INTERESTED IN READING THIS NEWSPAPER. WE SHALL BE HAPPY TO SEND THEM A SAMPLE COPY

'Don't Know What To Do About It'

The top secret Central Intelligence Agency admits that sexual perversion among its employes is a very "serious problem" and is considering setting up a psychiatric clinic to deal with the problem. So says United Press International in a dispatch from Washington.

Chairman Francis E. Walter of the House Committee on un-American Activities has reported that a psychiatrist by the name of Dr. Clarence Schilt of Silver Spring, Md., has conferred about the possibility of establishing a clinic in the top secret group because perversion is a problem and the authorities don't know what to do about it.

Holy cow! Don't know what to DO about perverts in a super-secret agency such as the CIA? The first thing to do about it is to get them out of the Agency. Then they can't do any harm.

These unfortunate people are always subject to blackmail because of their habits. As a result of those habits, they are unstable temperamentally, and are the worst possible security risks to have connected with a secrecy agency. They are as bad a security risk as Communists.

Instead of talking about a clinic, the first thing to do is to get **RID** of these people. Perhaps they need to be in a clinic somewhere else, **but NOT in a clinic in the CIA.**

If your eyes are popping out of your head over the ridiculousness of U. S. officials not knowing what to do about sexual perversion in the CIA just consider for a moment that the Defense Department said of one of the recent defectors to Moscow that he **ADMITTED** abnormal sex practices in his teens, **BUT** the officials said they did not consider teenage activities grounds for denying him employment. **It certainly ought to be grounds for denying employment in an organization of such a critical secret nature as THIS agency. In hiring personnel for such an agency, you do not take any chances on anybody having been reformed.**

Kindly people may want to hire an ex-convicted embezzler who has been released from prison after having served his term, but certainly one's desire to rehabilitate such a man does not go to the extent of making him a teller in a bank.

When you read of such fantastic goings-on in Washington, you wonder that the United States has survived as long as it has. There ought to be a very simple rule that all sexual perverts should be fired from ALL agencies of the government where security and secrecy are fundamental requirements. As a matter of fact, they ought to be fired from EVERYWHERE in the government, BUT CERTAINLY WE SHOULD BEGIN WITH SUPER-SECRET AGENCIES SUCH AS THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

(Reprinted from the MANCHESTER (N.H.) UNION LEADER)

JESSUP APPOINTMENT INCREASES MENACE POSED BY ANTI-U.S. WORLD COURT

By Florence Lyons

(Reprinted from THE LEDGER, Montrose, California.)

Cleverly, the last barrier to the certain election of Philip Jessup as the "American" judge on the 15-man UN International Court of Justice was removed this past week. Green Hackworth, abandoned by his own nation, the United States, was forced to "withdraw" his name from the list of nominees. Now the United States offers the UN voters but a single name--Philip C. Jessup. UN "tradition" assures the UN "Big Five" judges on the Court.

Before me is a volume of 1022 pages -- hearings held before a Senate Subcommittee back in 1951 giving Jessup his full chance to refute Senator Joe McCarthy's charge that Jessup had "an affinity for Communist causes."

That Senate Subcommittee, composed of three Democrats and two Republicans, decided Jessup was unfit to represent the United States as a delegate to the U.N.

DEFIES SENATE

Harry Truman defied this verdict of the Senate group and pinned a "U.S. Delegate" badge on Jessup and sent him off to the Sixth General Assembly of the UN anyway on an "interim appointment."

In January of this year, Jessup submitted a statement during the hearing on S. Res. 94 to repeal the Conally Amendment, demanding immediate repeal. He boasted that since 1929 he has worked to lure the U.S.A. into the World Court trap, under the old League of Nations then. He pointed with pride to the fact the U.S.A. is now deep in the trap thanks to the fact the UN planners deliberately made the UN World Court Statute an integral part of the UN Charter itself.

Jessup should know all about this -- he served as one of two "U. S. Advisers" to Hackworth, who was the U.S. representative on the 15-man UN Committee of Jurists, called March 24, 1945 by the U.S. "to prepare prior to the San Francisco Conference, a draft of a statute to be submitted to that Conference for consideration." It is an interesting sidelight on this crew that six of these 15 representatives or advisers were immediately elected judges on the UN Court -- including Hackworth, and the USSR's Krylov.

BOOSTS 'TREATY'

Jessup then was continued on as a "technical expert" on the U.S. Delegation to the UN San Francisco Conference, still working on the Statute of the Court.

Jessup's most recent "activity" was his appearance June, 1960, as a witness demanding Senate ratification of the UNesco-inspired, Pro-Soviet "Antarctic Treaty," which now legally has installed the Soviet Union in the Antarctic where it had no legitimate claim to be. Phleger, who helped nominate Jessup, was U.S. Negotiator on this fantastic sell-out of American best interests to those of the Communist conspiracy.

Panama and Cuba intend to use the UN Court to get the Panama Canal and our Cuban base away from us. Renewed demands will be made when Congress opens for repeal of the Connally Amendment, which now protects these crucial American "domestic" interests from this UN Court. Demand investigation of the Jessup nomination and preservation of the Connally Amendment NOW!

(Editor's note: The Democratic Party Platform and President-elect Kennedy both promise to repeal the Connally Amendment. Write the Governors of Southern States today and ask them to urge the Democratic presidential electors to deny their votes to Kennedy at the meeting of the Elector College on December 19, 1960.)

The Chickens Come Home to Roost

(Reprinted from THE WALL STREET JOURNAL)

President Eisenhower's order to curb U.S. spending abroad is less important for what it does than for what it says.

For what it says—painfully, reluctantly and shamefully—is that a generation's reckless fiscal policies have at last presented their harsh bill. The United States is now reduced to the little stratagems of an improvident householder trying to stave off the bill collector. The American dollar, once our pride and our strength, must now be propped up, even at the cost of begging from the nations we made rich.

Thus the order this week to bring home the wives and children of servicemen overseas; we can no longer afford to keep them. Henceforth the military stores must "Buy America"; and so must our foreign aid agency, the International Cooperation Administration, which was founded, ironically, to pour American dollars abroad. Missions overseas must be curtailed. And finally we must plead with Britain, Japan, West Germany and others not only to buy American themselves but to come to our rescue with foreign aid programs of their own.

But however ridiculous this sounds, there is nothing amusing in the prospect of the fall of the dollar from its once unquestioned preeminence among the moneys of the world. For there is not only the fact, as Mr. Eisenhower noted, that the dollar had become an essential cornerstone in international finance but also the fact that the integrity of our money is essential to our own economic well-being and military security.

And we can find nothing amusing, either, in the way the dollar has been brought to its present shabby estate.

For it has been brought to this point only by our own consummate foolishness. At the end of World War II the U.S. dollar, for all that it had suffered some inflation, was without peer among the moneys of the world. So much so that it seemed essential that we use some of them to rebuild our war-torn allies, out of gratitude, and our former enemies, out of charity. This we did, and we suppose there are few Americans today who regret it.

But this picture of ourselves as the great and rich America insiduously grew into that of an America with endless resources. We began to be bombarded with speeches about how we could support the whole free world and how we could, at one and the same time, grow richer ourselves by manufacturing an endless supply of these good, sound American dollars. What, after all, was a little inflation in a country that could produce as much as this one?

Anyone who said otherwise was an old curmudgeon. And so year after year our Government ran great deficits to try to give the people at home everything they wanted all at once and to pour billions of dollars around the world. Only in the last few years has there been any real effort to curb this Government spending, and even then the billions were still poured abroad and more were sought.

What happened, it seems to us, was bound to happen. Just a little over a year ago, in September, 1959, this newspaper reported that the officials in Washington who watched the books were already concerned at what inflation at home was doing to our foreign trade and what the huge give-away of dollars was doing to our balance of payments position. The only difference now is that the fiscal crisis then foreseen by a few can be discerned by nearly everybody.

In the last three years alone the U.S. has paid out $10 billion more than it received from abroad. The resulting deficits have been settled with our foreign creditors by outflows of gold and by increases in our dollar liabilities to other nations; since the end of 1957 the U.S. has lost some $4.5 billion of its gold stock.

Now it is true enough, as Mr. Eisenhower says, that the resultant pressure on the U.S. dollar is not beyond repair. The dollar remains a major currency of the world and its value, though shaken, still holds. There is a crisis only in the sense that we have come to a turning point, a decisive moment in which the illness can go one way or the other.

But make no mistake about that. No government would make the kind of statement about its currency that was made this week by the President unless it was compelled to do so by the force of events; Mr. Eisenhower himself said that it had been carefully considered for weeks. The U.S. dollar hangs in the balance between the preservation of its value and its devaluation.

And make no mistake in thinking that the small steps taken this week will alone preserve the balance; at the most they will "save" a billion dollars, and that only in time. The ailment is rooted in basic fiscal policies of many years' duration and it can be cured only by basic fiscal policies, and that means the policies of the incoming Administration. We are going to have to cut deeply into all our spending, foreign and domestic.

The lesson of all this is an ancient one—no nation, however rich, can go on forever abusing its financial resources with profiligacy. When it does, no man can name the day but any man can be certain that one day the chickens will come home to roost.

(Editor's note: THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN has just published a pamphlet entitled "HOW THE GOLD CRISIS AFFECTS YOU - The Gold War is Part of the Cold War". If you wish to join the citizen action movement to cut Big Federal Spending, which is causing a run on U.S. Gold Reserves, buy and distribute copies of this new pamphlet - TAX FAX No. 25. Prices - postpaid are: Single copy 25¢; 20 for $1.00; 40 for $2.00; 100 for $5.00; 500 for $20.00. Order today from THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans 18, Louisiana. Distribute this pamphlet to friends, employees, civic club members, etc.)

How to Start a.... New Political Party

George Boardman

(Reprinted from THE AMERICAN STATESMAN)

A new political party begins in the mind of just one person. Before additional steps are taken contact your Secretary of State and ask for a copy of the laws connected with the formation of a political party. Each State has entirely different laws concerning the formation of a new party, which should remind you that political parties are actually autonomous agencies within the separate states.

AFTER YOU have studied the laws of your state, you will probably realize that certain conditions must be met before your organization can actually become a political party. This, in turn, means that your organization is not subject to those laws until such time as it has complied with the conditions and is formally and legally acknowledged.

Now-what political product do you wish to sell? You have arrived at a cross roads very quickly, and at this point you can still procede alone or with others. Since this new party is your idea, you must know what kind of government and how much government you want. You can save time if you carefully and studiously outline the aims and goals and principles of your party.

AFTER YOU have outlined the principles for which your party will stand, take the typed result into a quiet room and have a long argument with yourself. What legislative action will have to be taken before your first principle can be achieved? What side results may also be anticipated? What arguments can you expect to be thrown against your plan? At this time, of course, you may decide to forget the whole thing but if you don't,

Get in touch with one more person who believes in the same things you do and ask him or her how they like the ideas of this new party. This is a good time to do some additional kicking around and to apply cold, impersonal logic to your plans and principles. It is also time for you to pick out the people you want on your first, basic committee. Let us assume you know a dozen people you believe will be interested in your ideas. Call on each of these people with your plans and principles carefully typed and ask each, separately, if they will serve in the post you have selected them for on the basis of your personal knowledge of the capabilities of the individual. To avoid complications, let us also assume that each is enthusiastic and accepts the suggested post in your organization. Now you call your first meeting.

Before the meeting be sure you have a complete set of your plans and principles for each of the participants at your meeting. In addition, outline, separately, the reasons for the meeting, what you expect to accomplish and the manner in which the meeting will be conducted.

If you begin this important meeting with the reading of the aims and goals of your new political party and ask each of the participants to indicate their consent to these aims and goals by signing their copy, you will save a tremendous amount of time and future arguments.

By all means, write up an account of this first meeting and send it to your **local paper**, complete with names and addresses of the founders of this organization which you hope will become a formally recognized political party, with a place on the Ballot.

YOUR NEXT move is quite simple. You have brought together a dozen or thirteen people and formed an organization. At this point, each of the other people should be obligated to bring in one more member, and we ask you to consider the next suggestion with care:—

THE ORIGINAL committee members are known to you, obviously, but you should ask each of them to, at this time, provide you with a **personal resume** of their activities, clubs, age, birthplace, marital status and so on. Before you hold another meeting with the new people who will be brought in by your committee members, require the same information from these new people. The beginning is the time to prevent infiltration into your organization by people who would eventually seek to destroy it. From personal experience, some of it quite bitter, this writer discovered that **those who seek to infiltrate and wreck efforts conceived in defense and opposition to collectivism in any form, are reluctant when it comes to providing personal data for any organization.** While this procedure provides no guarantee against such infiltration, it will give you something better than an even break right from the start.

NOW YOU are on your own. From this point on, you will have to decide how to build your organization, to finance it and how to comply with the election laws of your state. You started this thing and you should be the state chairman of the organization. Generally speaking there are two main types of state chairmen. One is the ruler type who does all the speech making, lays down the rules and regulations and tells the others what to do and how to do it. The other makes suggestions, makes sure that everyone has an opportunity to make speeches, keeps meetings under control and winds up being the only one to sweep out and empty the waste basket. You will need a name for your party but most of all you must find people who still believe in honest government and who are willing to spend time, money and energy to achieve honest government. **GOOD LUCK!**

(Editor's note: The above article is reprinted from THE AMERICAN STATESMAN, published by J. Bracken Lee, former Governor of Utah and presently the Mayor of Salt Lake City - elected as an Independent! Send $1.00 to THE AMERICAN STATESMAN - a weekly newspaper - for a 4-week trial subscription.)

Red Sympathizer "Bites The Dust"

Carefully hidden by the nation's press was one very important result of the recent election.

Congressman Charles O. Porter of Oregon, friend of anti-American and Soviet-loving Cyrus Eaton....Charles Porter, chief apologist and propagandist for the bearded Soviet bandit in Cuba, was defeated for re-election to the U. S. Congress.

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN congratulates the voters of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon for refusing to permit Porter to continue to disgrace the United States with his belly-crawling before America's mortal enemy - Soviet and satellite Communists.

Special attention - readers in Pennsylvania! You've got a real "problem" with that guy Joseph S. Clark, who somehow got to be your U. S. Senator.

Clark likes Porter....the voters don't like Porter...how long will it be before the Pennsylvania voters don't like Clark either?

'Purge' Talk

(Reprinted from CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS)

Lyndon Johnson's sole function on the Democratic ticket was to hold the South in the Democratic column. His job was to persuade Southerners that he would look out for their interests.

The majority in Tennessee, Virginia and Florida wisely did not buy that campaign pitch. But the majority in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas did bite.

How long will they have to wait to see whether their judgment was wise or unwise? Not long. Already, the handwriting is clearly on the wall. It was put there on the day after the election!

Already, Vice President-elect Johnson is thinking in terms of a "purge" of the conservative - controlled House Rules Committee, which under the wise and able chairmanship of Rep. Howard Smith, a Virginia Democrat, has headed off some of the worst radical legislation the Kennedy-Johnson elements have sought.

As Vice President, Lyndon Johnson intends to pull the teeth of that Southerner-based conservative roadblock, so more anti-South legislation can pass.

When this--and worse--happens, can North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas complain? They voted for it.

The Children's Crusade

A late-blooming attraction of Senator Kennedy's New Frontier seems aimed at those youngsters barely old enough to vote. For Senator Kennedy would offer to every draft-age boy and girl the opportunity to skip military service and serve in an overseas "peace corps."

The U.S. would send shiploads of these youthful Americans to the four corners of the earth, there to assist elder aid-givers and exert their infectious charm on the natives. Senator Kennedy is "convinced" that our youngsters would roundly defeat the Communists and their devious schemes.

While sharing his esteem for the younger generation and some of his skepticism concerning the U.S. foreign service, we doubt that Senator Kennedy's children's crusade would do anything of the sort. More likely, it would inflict on the world still more American short-termers, off on a global lark at the taxpayers' expense.

To defeat the professional revolutionaries dispatched by Moscow the U.S. needs fully professional diplomats and a sound foreign policy. In our zeal to save the world for democracy, let us not begin dispatching our draft-dodgers.

(Reprinted from THE WALL STREET JOURNAL)

Beware Of Chibas

(Reprinted from Charleston (S.C.) NEWS & COURIER)

With the presidential election out of the way, talk of what to do about Cuba will give way to serious planning.

In making plans, the President-elect should beware of supporting a recently formed anti-Castro group which calls itself the Revolutionary Movement of the People.

Though this group gives lip service to anti-communism, it is headed by Raul Chibas, one of Fidel Castro's closest associates until very recently. Chibas was an official of the Castro government throughout the period of the firing squad terror, confiscation of U. S. property and infiltration of Cuba by communists.

Now he says the Castro revolution has been betrayed by communists. That's not a viewpoint that the United States can afford to approve.

The Castro revolution was Red-infiltrated and anti-USA from the start. Any so-called resistance leader who praises the original Castro revolution should not receive encouragement from the U.S. government.

Fatal Statistics

During the recent election campaign, both presidential candidates were pushed about by overly-enthusiastic supporters. Fortunately, both escaped with no physical damage. But, if you think that's bad, contrast this with the manner in which Russia treats its "brass." We are indebted to The Weekly Crusader, Tulsa, Oklahoma, for the following "fatal" statistics:

Up to 1954, the Russians had SHOT:

9 out of 11 Cabinet Ministers holding office in 1936.

5 out of 7 Presidents of the last central executive committee.

43 out of 53 Secretaries of the Communist Party central office.

15 out of 27 who wrote the 1936 Constitution.

70 out of 80 of the Soviet War Council.

Since 1917, 3 out of every 5 Marshals of the Soviet Army were executed as spies or traitors.

And harken to this, all the members of Lenin's first politburo, the inner cabinet, were shot—except one—Joseph Stalin.

* * * *

Russia's "Big Shots" do seem to have a habit of getting "shot" —so far Nikita has confined himself to being only "half-shot," but right frequently.

STUDENTS FIGHT COMMUNISM

NEW PUBLICATION EDITED BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The Political Science Club of Marquette University High School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has recently published the first issue of a new publication, "THE TRUTH About Communism."

This first issue of "THE TRUTH About Communism" is entitled "Communism's Greatest Asset: Our Ignorance," and is ideally suited as an "eye-opener" for those who are completely uninformed about the Communist conspiracy. Hence this new publication is geared to provide high school and college students with a beginning knowledge of the inroads Communism has made upon the free world, and the imperative need that every American citizen should be informed in order to resist the threats of Communist aggression.

Individual adult subscriptions are $2.00 a year. However, subscription rates for "school class" quantities are considerably lower, and class sponsorships are urged. Trial copies in class quantities are free.

"THE TRUTH about Communism" will be published at least six times a year - eight times a year if possible.

A non-profit corporation, THE TRUTH, Inc., has been organized to publish and distribute (particularly to schools) "THE TRUTH About Communism". Inquiries and subscriptions may be sent to: The Truth, Inc., 2450 W. Wells, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin.

U.N. DOCUMENTATION AVAILABLE

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN highly recommends to its readers that they subscribe to FLORENCE FOWLER LYONS REPORTS ON UNESCO.

Florence Fowler Lyons has achieved widespread national recognition through her excellent documentation and exposure of the United Nations, UNESCO, World Court, the Connally Amendment, UNICEF, and all related matters. No file on these subjects is complete without the thoroughly researched material provided by Florence Fowler Lyons.

Florence Fowler Lyons names NAMES, gives you the names and the facts and tells you what the increased control over U.S. affairs by International organizations means to you and your future.

Subscriptions should be sent to FLORENCE FOWLER LYONS REPORTS ON UNESCO, Post Office Box 215, Montrose, California. $3.00 a year.

$ $ $!

"The way to make money is to start your own country and apply for foreign aid."
--Bob Hope

The AMERICAN WAY AS VIEWED BY McGlohon

A LONE DISSENTER

On a recent evening we were present at a meeting where the speaker was holding forth on the benefits that would accrue to America with the enactment of the Proposed 23rd Amendment—the Amendment which will abolish the personal federal income tax and take the Federal Government out of competition with private enterprise.

The speaker stressed how nice it would be if three years from now, one would not have to struggle with form 1040, and on or before April 15, send Uncle Sam a huge slice of one's earnings. He asked for a show of hands of those who would welcome such a relief from both toil and attack on pocketbook. Every hand went up but one.

Toward the close of his address, the speaker could contain his curiosity no longer. He asked the lone dissenter why he wouldn't welcome the end of personal federal income taxes. His answer was short, simple and much to the point.

"You see," he said, "I'm a certified public accountant. Each winter and early spring I derive a considerable income helping out poor unfortunates with that form 1040. Would you have me help kill that golden goose that lays those golden eggs for me?"

Well, anyway, he had a reason —if not a good one.

EXTRA COPIES

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper

Available!

ORDER TODAY bulk copies of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN and distribute to your friends, business acquaintances, club members, and employees, etc.

GOING TO A MEETING SOON? Order your extra copies of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN to distribute there.

10 Copies	$1.00
25 Copies	$2.00
50 Copies	$4.00
100 Copies	$8.00
Over 100 Copies	$8.00 per 100

Order Today

These will be shipped to you IN BULK, POSTAGE PREPAID, ready for you to address, mail or distribute.

Please make your check payable to:

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

7314 Zimpel Street

New Orleans 18, Louisiana

JESSUP . . . From Page 1

denied the charges. They include Alger Hiss, Frank Coe, Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, Frederick V. Field and Lauchlin Currie.

Several years later the State Department asked Jessup to organize the State Department Policy Conference of October, 1949. As chief advisor to Dean Acheson, Jessup arranged for a group of so-called Far Eastern experts (all of whom were connected with the IPR) to make recommendations on U.S. policy. Harold Stassen, who attended the conference, has testified that the whole affair was rigged in favor of a group led by Lattimore and Lawrence Rosinger, both of whom have been identified under oath as Communists.

Stassen testified that he repeatedly urged Jessup to reject the advice of the Lattimore-Rosinger group, only to be told that the "greater logic is on their side." A Stassen memorandum detailed the Lattimore-Rosinger-Jessup policies thusly:

(1) Europe should be given priority over Asia.

(2) Aid to Asia should not be started until after a "long and careful study."

(3) Russian Communists should be viewed "as not aggressive as Hitler" and as "not apt to take direct military action to expand their empire."

(4) Communist China should be recognized by the U.S.

(5) Britain and India should be urged to follow suit in recognizing Red China.

(6) The Chinese Communists should be allowed to take over Formosa.

(7) The Communists should not be stopped from taking Hong Kong "if they insist."

(8) Nehru should not be given aid because of his "reactionary and arbitrary tendencies."

(9) The Nationalist "blockade" of China should be broken and economic aid sent to the Chinese Communists.

(10) No aid should be sent to Chiang or to the anti-Communist guerrillas in South China.

Following these and other disclosures--Jessup's membership, for instance, in four officially-cited Communist fronts; his impassioned defense of Alger Hiss--the Senate in 1952 refused to approve him as Ambassador to the UN. A year later a move was underfoot to remove him from his Truman-appointed post as Ambassador to the General Assembly. This led Russian Foreign Minister Vishinsky to say:

"I learned the other day with some dismay that 37 Senators had asked the United States government if it would dismiss Mr. Jessup from here because he was rather sympathetically inclined toward an un-American way of thought,...I must express my sympathy for Mr. Jessup."

Such is the record of Philip Jessup, the Administration choice for U.S. judge on the World Court.

GREAT POTENTIAL FOR NEW PARTY

"THE CONSERVATIVE SIDE OF THE GREAT DEBATES"

On November 3 and 4, immediately preceding the November 8th Presidential election, "The Conservative Side of the Great Debates" was presented by Kent Courtney, publisher of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, and news analyst for THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN. This special, pre-election half-hour program was aired over nine 50,000-watt stations and was heard in all parts of the nation. So great was the response to this broadcast, "The Conservative Side of the great Debates" that 1270 postcards and letters were received from 44 States during the two weeks following the broadcast, and are still being received. This special program was also broadcast by a number of other radio stations which regularly broadcast THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN.

Kent Courtney, whose name appeared on the New Jersey ballot as the candidate of the Conservative Party of New Jersey for the Vice-Presidency, charged in "The Conservative Side of the Great Debates" that Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon had not told voters "the full facts." He stated: "Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon promise higher taxes. The truth is, your taxes can be reduced . . . Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon promise more Welfare State Big Spending, which is turning America into a Socialist State. The truth is, Big Federal Spending can and must be stopped if the United States is to survive as a Constitutional Republic . . . ."

Courtney then went on to outline the Conservative position on such vital issues as the Foreign Aid Giveaway of U.S. taxpayers dollars, Communist domination and control of the United Nations, Communist sympathizers in the U.S. State Department, the soaring national debt, government control of farmers, wasteful and unnecessary Federal spending, etc.

In closing all listeners were urged to vote for Conservatives in the Congressional elections. Mr. Courtney stressed the need for a nationwide new Conservative party to be established right after the presidential election, and asked all those interested in working for this goal to write to THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN.

The great majority of the 1270 cards and letters received from 44 States expressed interest in a national new party movement, and eagerness to get to work immediately in preparation for the 1962 Congressional elections, and the 1964 Presidential election.

The tremendous response to this special broadcast clearly indicates the "grass roots" enthusiasm for new party action.

If you wish to read for yourself "The Conservative Side of the Great Debates," we will be happy to furnish copies at 10¢ each. Send your request to THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans 18, Louisiana, enclosing 10¢ for each copy of "The Conservative Side of the Great Debates."

dear reader

Unless you are a paid subscriber to this newspaper, this free sample copy may be the ONLY ONE you receive.

To Keep Up With News of NEW PARTY ACTIVITY

mail coupon TODAY

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I wish to subscribe to "The Independent American"

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY AND STATE_____

Please send me the next 12 issues – $3.00_____

Please send me the next 24 issues – $5.00_____

Please send me a SPECIAL TRIAL OFFER

Nov.—Dec. 4 issues – $1.00_____

Please Make Checks Payable to

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

7314 Zimpel Street New Orleans 18, La.

CONSERVATIVE PARTY ORGANIZING IN NORTH CAROLINA

George Boardman, in an article elsewhere in this issue gives a logical step-by-step formula for starting and organizing a new political party. In North Carolina, Mr. A. G. Whitener and Mr. W. S. Griffith along with many others are actively putting into practice what George Boardman has suggested.

The Conservative Party of North Carolina started when certain men came to the conclusion that something had to be done. They immediately began to canvass their business associates for financial support. They made contact with existing organizations which had been fighting for the same conservative principles within the existing political parties.

Letters to the editors appear in North Carolina papers almost every day outlining the conservative position on current issues of the day. In recent months, of course, these have been directed along the lines that neither political party offered a meaningful choice to truly conservative voters who would not compromise their principles of voting for the lesser (who is to know?) of two evil men.

Petitions have been drawn up according to the laws of North Carolina and are being distributed so that ten thousand signatures can be obtained in order to get official recognition of THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY of North Carolina.

Members of the Conservative Party recently sent a telegram of congratulations to the Governor of Louisiana and to the Legislature of Louisiana supporting the fight of Louisiana against the tyranny of the Federal District Court in Louisiana which is interfering with the local control of schools.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY of NORTH CAROLINA and the many businessmen affiliated with it are using mass media of communication to reach the citizens and the voters. They sponsor radio programs of conservative news and opinion and take out newspaper advertisements asking the people to listen to these radio programs. THEY ARE GETTING RESULTS IN OBTAINING ADDITIONAL VOLUNTEER WORKERS FOR THE PARTY. Here is their radio schedule of programs:

CITY	STATION	TIME	DAY	ON YOUR DIAL
BURLINGTON	WBAG	12:45	Sunday	1150
HIGH POINT	WHPE	12:45	Sunday	1070
HIGH POINT	WMFR	1:00	Monday	1230
MOUNT AIRY	WPAQ	5:45	Saturday	740

By means of this notice we suggest that all subscribers in NORTH CAROLINA who wish to get active politically volunteer their services to Mr. A. G. Whitener and Mr. W. S. Griffith to help form local committees of THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY throughout all of North Carolina. Just drop a letter to THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, Box 1346, High Point, North Carolina or Box 312, Rocky Mount, North Carolina. When you send one dollar or more you will receive a bumper sticker for your car, a membership card, and a copy of the petition.

The Independent American Party In Michigan

The New Party Convention sponsored by THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN in October of 1959 was the starting point of the conservative political movement in Michigan. Thomas B. Staffin of Detroit worked with several existing taxpayer, independent farmer, libertarian, and neighborhood improvement groups to recruit able and tested leadership for the building of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN PARTY of Michigan.

The first job Staffin set out to do was to recruit a representative number of hard workers from various organizations throughout the State of Michigan. The second step was the adoption of a platform. The third step was getting enough signatures on officially approved petitions to qualify the INDEPENDENT AMERICAN PARTY to appear on Michigan ballots.

Circulators of petitions ran into trouble such as being harassed by local police at the suggestion of frightened Democrat politicians. There was the difficulty of getting people to sign the petition in EXACTLY the same way as their names appeared on the voter registration rolls. This important petition signing activity proceeded all during the winter months and was finally completed in May of 1960.

Two problems now faced the small group of determined men and women. First was to get thousands of copies of their platform into the hands of voters throughout the state and thus let the people know that a new conservative political force was in the making in Michigan. Another task was to recruit sufficient numbers of candidates so that each candidate would be a responsible and energetic salesman for the principles of the INDEPENDENT AMERICAN PARTY OF MICHIGAN.

The first state convention of the party confirmed the offices of Thomas Staffin as Chairman, Hubert P. Underwood as Secretary, and John A. Smith as Treasurer. The Convention officially adopted the platform and nominated twenty Presidential Electors. Because the Party had been able to obtain the full time services of an organizer for three months, the party was able to put on the ballot some ninety (90) candidates less than eight months after a few men had determined to start a new political party in Michigan. This achievement was important because each candidate in addition to putting out his own campaign card also was responsible for the distribution of the platform of the party.

Eight men ran for the U.S. House of Representatives. One man for Senator, thirteen ran for State Senator, and forty ran for State Representative.

As we go to press final and complete returns have not been received from Michigan, but regardless of the number of votes counted the important result is that these men and women under the inspired leadership of Thomas B. Staffin have proved that good Americans can create a new political party in order to give the people a choice.

Wieland and Rubottom Were NOT Ousted!

(Reprinted from the MANCHESTER (N.H.) NEWS LEADER)

It should not escape the notice of the American people that two State Department officials charged with responsibility for the rise of Castro to power in Cuba, Roy H. Rubottom and William A. Wieland, have not been fired. They have simply been reassigned to other posts where, if the situation arises, they can indulge in the same muddled thinking concerning Communist intentions that helped the Communists to power in Cuba.

This newspaper has been complaining for some time about Rubottom, assistant secretary of state for Latin American affairs, and Wieland, director of the office of Caribbean and Mexican affairs. We do not deny a feeling of gratification that both have been removed from the policy-making positions from which they helped to direct America's defeat by communism in Cuba. Nor can we deny a sense of relief that State Department personnel are no longer being briefed by Herbert Matthews of the New York Times, who makes a habit of being wrong about communism. We cannot be sure, however, that Matthews' fall from grace will be permanent. After all, anyone who was as wrong about the Spanish Civil War as was Herbert Matthews never should have been writing about the civil war in Cuba in the first place.

We note with interest and no little alarm, however, that Rubottom has been sent to a sensitive Latin American post in Argentina to serve as ambassador, while Wieland is being briefed in Germanic languages, preparatory to an assignment which has not as yet been revealed.

We would not be in the least bit surprised to find that Wieland is being shifted to an even more sensitive post--in Berlin.

The Harvard "Shell Game"

Recently there has been published by VERITAS FOUNDATION, New York City, a 114 page booklet entitled "Keynes at Harvard".

This is a most scholarly study of the effect that the teachings of John Maynard Keynes has had on the graduates of the economic courses of Harvard University. These graduates of America's most respected school of higher learning have been poisoned by Keynesism, which interpretation of economics is regarded by the authors as being responsible in large part for the critical attitude of educators and bureaucrats regarding the health and propriety of the free enterprise or capitalist system.

"Keynes at Harvard" is subtitled "Economic Deception as a Political Credo" and reveals in orderly fashion the theories of state socialism that have been taught at Harvard for the last SEVENTY-FIVE years.. Is it any wonder that there is such a large number of educators and government service officers who are leading the attack on the free enterprise system? Many of the prominent teachers of economics in all of the colleges and universities throughout the United States are products of Harvard and are proponents of the State ownership theories advanced by Keynes and his disciples.

On page 55 we get an inkling of the kind of intellectual queeriosity Keynes was, when he wrote in the 1933 Yale Review: "The decadent international but individualistic capitalism, in the hands of which we found ourselves after the war (WW I), is not a success. It is not intelligent, it is not beautiful, it is not just, it is not virtuous - and it does not deliver the goods. In short we (Keynesian Socialists) dislike it and are beginning to despise it." (Parenthetical comment supplied - Ed.)

On page 69 and 70 we find the following revealing paragraphs:

"George Soule, a well known American socialist and an advocate of Keynesism admits the relationship of Keynes to the Swedish socialists when he states:

"Wicksell stimulated a number of well-known living Swedish economists, for example, Myrdal, Lundberg, and Ohlin, to carry similar work further. They became known as the Stockholm School. Their doctrine, though parallel to that of Keynes, differs in detail and presents a less comprehensive theoretical system.

"The socialist economist Joseph Schumpeter, while at Harvard, indicated that Keynes' General Theory was strictly a political stroke, brilliantly done, to palm off socialism on the world under the guise of saving capitalism. Professor Arthur Smithies, current chairman of the Harvard Economics Department, himself a Keynesian, points this out clearly:

"Schumpeter did not credit Keynes with a single major improvement in the technique of economic analysis. His admiration was confined to the skill with which Keynes constructed a vehicle to convey his ideology--an ideology that, in Schumpeter's view, rivals Marx in undermining the pillars of capitalism."

Please note the mention of Myrdal. This is the same Gunnar Myrdal who wrote a book entitled "The American Dilemma", a socialistic treatise which influenced the U.S. Supreme Court in the school forced integration cases which have caused so much social turmoil in the United States in recent years.

Keynes at Harvard outlines the direct relationship between the Socialism of Karl Marx, the Fabian Socialists, the aims and methods of the Communists of today and the adoption of Keynes' theories as a means to destroy free enterprise and impose Socialist rule on the United States through an expanding Federal Bureaucracy.

We suggest that every reader of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN send $2.00 for a copy of KEYNES AT HARVARD, Box 340, Wall Street Station, New York 5, New York.

BIG STRIDES MADE BY CONSTITUTION PARTY IN WEST TEXAS

Midland, Texas (Special) -- Dr. Martin Boone, "wheelhorse" of the Constitution Party in West Texas reports that Dr. Dorothy Wyvell, Constitution Party candidate for Congress, politically unknown 10 months ago, received approximately 6,000 more votes than the Republican candidate, Dr. Wyvell chalked up more than one-third of the number of votes cast for the Democrat candidate in this traditionally Democratic area.

Based on these results, Dr. Boone feels that the Constitution Party will carry the district in 1962. The Constitution Party of Texas has already formulated plans to set up party organizations in each county immediately, and will run candidates for local office.

Dr. Boone writes:

"From unknown to 30% of votes in less than 10 months. Sounds impossible, but that is the story of the Constitution Party in West Texas. The people are beginning to look for a way out of tax slavery, and this proves it. We will win in 1962! Dr. Wyvell, our candidate for U.S. Representative, got 24,497; Rutherford (Democrat) - 61,430; and Chapman (Republican) only 18,871!!! ...We carried Midland County, and will carry the district in 1962. We plan to continue working from now on by setting up party organizations in each county and by getting candidates into every local race we can. We will make statements concerning every local issue, and in general develop an opposition...."

Readers in the Midland area who wish to learn more about the Constitution Party and its activities are urged to contact Dr. Martin H. Boone, 210 North "C" Street, Midland, Texas.

FLUORIDATION REJECTED

Since little or no information has appeared in metropolitan newspapers about last week's referenda regarding fluoridation, your readers would no doubt be interested in the outcome.

Cincinnati, Ohio, citizens rejected fluoridation 107,782 versus 83,685; this was its second defeat at the polls. In November '53 they voted 76,155 against, 56,246 for fluoridation.

In Saginaw, Michigan, citizens likewise defeated fluoridation 15,632 versus 11,842 for the second time. In 1954 they voted to abandon fluoridation which had been in operation since 1950.

In Wisconsin, a small town, Weyauwega, where fluoridation was put into operation in 1954, voted to discontinue it. Antigo citizens voted 2,409 versus 1,777 to abandon fluoridation. Waukesha rejected fluoridation 5,712 versus 3,612. Montello voted 293 versus 258; this was its second vote against fluoridation in the last five years.

In Joplin, Mo., 8,258 citizens voted against, 6,758 for fluoridation. Freeport, Ill. citizens rejected fluoridation for the third time, 6,586 versus 5,203.

Two Minnesota towns, Faribault and Willmar, defeated fluoridation: the former 2,900 versus 2,400; the latter 2,767 versus 1,948. In Faribault fluoridation, adopted by City Council action, was terminated in March 1955 after 18 months' operation when the citizens voted against it.

As in Cincinnati, in Marin County and in Sacramento, California, fluoridation was forced to the ballot for the second time by proponents. Fluoridation was rejected by a much larger margin than the first time in Marin County: 39,133 versus 31,000; in Sacramento: 49,525 versus 31,868.

Fluoridation has been defeated in every 1960 California referendum.

MARJORIE A. WELLS.
SECRETARY
National Fluoridation News.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: For further information contact NATIONAL FLUORIDATION NEWS, 2930 W. Grand Blvd., Detroit 2, Mich.)

More Anti-Red Groups Needed

"When groups submerge their differences, they frequently submerge their motivating forces, and the organization so formed is like an automobile without gasoline because the dynamics of action reside in the submerged differences....Organizational unity is a mirage. The great need is multiplicity, not unity. The unity of a free society resides in its diversity."

--Dr. Fred Schwarz
Cong. Record 8-27-60

"I am a great believer in luck: I find that the harder I work the more I seem to have of it."

--Anonymous

GOLDWATER . . From Page 1

J. Bracken Lee, publisher, quoted you as stating "To start a third party movement in this county, I think, would be disastrous. I don't think it could possibly succeed. But even if it could succeed, I would be against it, and I would certainly never lend my name to such a movement."

GOLDWATER VIEWS ON "THIRD PARTY" AFTER THE ELECTION

The New Orleans TIMES-PICAYUNE of November 19, 1960, in a column by J. McMullen of the Chicago Daily News Service, Phoenix dateline, quotes you, Senator Goldwater, as stating "I would think we would tend toward creation of a new Conservative party. I think we have to have a two-party system."

In the same article, you are quoted as stating "To create a national party, we have to try to include all interpretations of Republicanism or work for the day when there is a realignment of parties. I think that realignment is eventually going to happen."

Mr. McMullen, in his article then states: "Goldwater said there will have to be some 'top-level discussions' soon to decide where the Republican Party is heading."

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

Being of a very direct mind, I find the above quotations attributed to you "pro" and "con" a new party, quite confusing, to say the least. First there is that phrase "top-level discussions." Between whom, Senator Goldwater? Die-hard "old guard" Republicans, who never learn from experience and still have the conceit to think that they can defeat Rockefeller and take over the G.O.P.? Conservatives need leadership, of course -- but not the type of leadership that compromises, irrespective of the wishes of the people, and then expects the people to follow and likewise compromise their own principles -- all in the name of "party loyalty" or "nobody could be worse than Kennedy!" I am wondering if these "top-level discussions" are going to come to the conclusion that Republicans should "get together and exert pressure" on Rockefeller so that the Republican Party will turn to the right. Exerting pressure on Rockefeller is like trying to drain the ocean with a teaspoon! Rockefeller has not spent millions of dollars through his various foundations, whose purpose is to "brainwash" the American public to the left, in order to turn around now and assume a position of the right!

Despite the tremendous and enthusiastic support from individuals and delegates at the Republican Convention last July, and despite the public support from Conservatives you enjoyed throughout the country, you were not able at the Convention or after the campaign to influence Rockefeller in any way whatsoever, and it would be the height of folly, I believe, to hope that you could muster public opinion in order to make Mr. Rockefeller change his ways. Mr. Rockefeller is not interested in public opinion. Mr. Rockefeller and his multi-million-dollar foundations seek to "brainwash" the American public to accept Socialism and one-world government. Thus Rockefeller seeks to create public opinion - not be responsive to it. Therefore I find that any "top-level discussions" between the hierarchy of G.O.P. Conservatives which aims at recapturing the Republican Party from Rockefeller is doomed to failure at the beginning. In other words, such a policy would call on Conservatives throughout the nation to waste their efforts, their time, and their energies during the next four years. Such a policy would lead only to a blind alley in 1964, when it could be expected Conservatives would again be urged by Conservative leaders to forsake their principles and support Nixon or Rockefeller because "anyone would be better than Kennedy"!

If that is the way the "top-level" GOP-ers are planning it, they can count me out! To use the old hackneyed phrase - "Once burned, twice shy!"

Therefore I say: How do you stand, Sir? If Nixon is the candidate in 1964, would you support him? Would you accept the Vice-Presidential nomination if Nixon were the Presidential candidate -- even though you disagree with Nixon on almost every major point?

WOULD GOLDWATER SERIOUSLY CONSIDER A NEW PARTY?

And now I quote again your statement in the column by Jay McMullen, Chicago Daily News Service, of November 19th, where you, Senator Goldwater, said "I would think we would tend toward creation of a new Conservative party."

If the above statement is your considered opinion in view of the closeness of the recent Presidential election, which showed surprising strength for the cause of Conservatism throughout the nation, then it could well be that the nation's Conservatives have at last found a leader for their new party movement, a national new Conservative party, composed of Conservative Democrats and Conservative Republicans.

Rockefeller, Reuther, and Kennedy can be defeated in 1964 if a Conservative leader steps forward now and assumes leadership of the new Conservative party. It will take four years of "grass roots" effort to organize at the precinct level so that there will be Conservative "poll watchers" in every ward and precinct in the nation to guarantee that the Liberals don't steal the election in 1964.

Where do you stand, Sir? Are you, or are you not in favor of a new national Conservative political party? Would you assume leadership of the new party? What are your plans for the future?

Lest you think that because I happen to live in the South, I am a Democrat, please be assured that I was a Republican, but when the GOP deserted its Conservative principles several years ago, I changed my registration to "Independent."

How do you stand, Sir?

Sincerely,

Phoebe Courtney

PHOEBE COURTNEY
Editor

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Perhaps readers of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN would like to write their own letters to Senator Goldwater asking him where he stands now that the election is over. Write him today -- ask him how he feels about a new Conservative party -- ask him if he will lead a new Conservative party -- ask him how soon he will make his decision to lead a new Conservative party. Ask Senator Goldwater to tell you if he has made the decision to completely oppose Rockefeller. Particularly ask Senator Goldwater if he will support Rockefeller or Nixon for the presidency in 1964. Also I believe all Conservatives should know now whether in the future Senator Goldwater will support left-wingers such as Senators Clifford Case, Javits, etc., simply because they are Republicans. Let's get this important question settled now! THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN would greatly appreciate it if you would send us copies both of the letter you write Senator Goldwater, and his reply to you!)

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Salvador De Madariaga, who was once head of the disarmament section of the League of Nations, has suggested the proposition that a first step toward disarmament could be accomplished by abolishing the electrically charged fences, the minefields, the machine-gun turrets, and the packs of hunting dogs along the borders of the Communist countries.

ATTENTION!

CIVIC CLUBS, NEW PARTIES
PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS – STATES RIGHTERS
POLITICAL CLUBS
CITIZENS COUNCILS
UP TO 100 FREE COPIES
OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN
AVAILABLE TO YOU WRITE US YOUR NEEDS